(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை ____________________

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் ____________________

(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் ____________________

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

____________________ துறை

அரசாணை எண்.	அச்சகம்
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	பலவகை
நாள்:	20

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது.

ஆவண. கா. 1–182–2–20,000 Cps.–15–11–2019 [HCL-II]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Public Works (1910) Department.

Confidential

1385

30124

G.O., No. 1018 W
CONFIDENTIAL

DATED 23rd Septr. 1910.

The Notes
in this G.O. have been printed.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Relation between P.W. Officers and Collectors of districts.

Issuing revised rules regarding the —

(Confidential)

23.9.1910

[P. W. 9.
2,250—22-7-09.]

Indexed.

Note Intimation sent to Madras office for the tables, Index & R9 books &c on 28.9.1910
Rāle

1

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

ESTABLISHMENT.

CONFIDENTIAL.

Recd. } 1910. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 1018 W., 23rd September 1910.

N. P.

Relation between Public Works Officers and Collectors of Districts.

Issuing revised rules regarding the —.

CONFIDENTIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

READ—the following papers :—

I

G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902.

ABSTRACT.—Publishing revised rules regarding the relation of Public Works officers to Collectors of districts.

II

G.O., No. 1581 W., dated 2nd June 1902.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on certain points raised in connection with the above rules.

III

Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 2412-A (Confdl. No. 61), dated 22nd July 1907.

The Hon'ble Mr. J. N. ATKINSON,
Commissioner of Revenue Settlement.

The Hon'ble Mr. J. TWIGG,
Commissioner of Salt, Abkári and Separate Revenue.

The Hon'ble Mr. J. ANDREW,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.

Mr. R. H. SHIPLEY,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.

Read—the following paper :—

Letter—from A. BUTTERWORTH, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of Trichinopoly.
To—the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Survey, Land Records and Agriculture.
Dated—the 1st March 1907.
No.—12 (Confdl.).

On the occasion of the visit to Trichinopoly of the Public Works Department Establishment Committee, I furnished the President of that body with some particulars indicative of delay in disposal of business by the Public Works Department in this district, but that officer replied that the matter lay outside the scope of the Committee's enquiries. I therefore submit these particulars to the Board, because they may not unreasonably be held to point to a defect in the present system whereunder the Collector is deprived of all authority over the Executive Engineer.

2. The twenty-four notes attached relate to cases taken from my list of pending papers, and though I am far from denying that in several instances the delay which has occurred in the past was unavoidable and that in others the Collector might have invoked the authority of the Superintending Engineer more freely than he did, there

remains a certain residue where avoidable delay has occurred and where that delay could, in my opinion, have been reduced had the Collector possessed a certain measure of direct control over the Executive Engineer which is denied to him at present. I am fully aware that engineering questions cannot generally be decided offhand, that protracted enquiries are often essential and that this district has suffered from inadequacy of establishment, and, above all, I am desirous of casting no reflection upon the present Executive Engineer, whom I know to be working zealously in the endeavour to cope with a mass of business which should have been done long ago and to whose courtesy in considering the crude proposals of us (Revenue officers) and readiness in complying with my demands upon his time, I am greatly indebted. In short, the object of my letter is not to complain of old delays but to advance them as partial justification for reviving the old question whether the Collector should not have authority, co-ordinately with the Superintending Engineer, to direct the movements of the Executive Engineer in case such a measure seems to him to be necessary.

3. This proposal I diffidently put forward with reference to the special conditions of this district rather than as one necessarily suitable for general application. In no district in which I have served are the relations between the Public Works Department and the Revenue Department so close as they are in Trichinopoly. This peculiarity arises out of the system of channel irrigation, in respect of which the functions of the two departments are far from being clearly discriminated. I asked the Public Works Department about a year ago for particulars of the channels upon which they have expended money during the last fifteen years with a view to arriving at some definite arrangement as to the control of channels in the future, but so far the Public Works Department have, I believe, been unable to pick out the statistics, and this difficulty perhaps serves to show the uncertainty which is felt as to the management of the channels. As a rule it may be said that the Revenue Department is responsible for maintaining the korambu and the leading channel up to the head sluice which may be several miles away, while the Public Works Department controls the main channel itself and the Revenue Department again has charge of the branches. Or the Revenue Department may control the whole channel and yet look to the Public Works Department to carry out all masonry works in connection therewith. Often it is still uncertain which department is responsible for doing maintenance or repair work. In a few days a conference is to be held between the Revenue and Public Works officers to elaborate a scheme applicable to all channels, but it is not probable that it will be found possible to discriminate so sharply between the functions of the two departments as to render them practically independent of one another.

4. It especially is in view of this close connection between the departments that I should like to see the Collector given authority somewhat in excess of that bestowed by G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, and G.O., No. 1581 W., dated 2nd June 1902. It seems to me that Superintending Engineers have to manage areas so large that they cannot be expected to exercise so close a control over Executive Engineers as, in the case of men who need driving, is sufficient to keep them up to their work. I attach no particular merit to the control of Collectors, but at least the Collector is on the spot; he is the principal Civil Executive officer in the district; it is to him that the ryots look to redress their grievances; he has agents everywhere and, in short, he is naturally in a better position than the Superintending Engineer to know when a grievance exists which ought to be speedily attended to. It must be remembered, too, that the Executive Engineer is often (as twice here in succession) only an Assistant Engineer and the position of independence which he occupies in respect of matters with which the Collector is so closely concerned is not entirely suitable, having regard to the official positions of the two officers. Of course it is open to the Collector to address the Superintending Engineer when the Executive Engineer fails to perform his duty, but that officer may well be personally unacquainted with the urgency of the matter in regard to which the Collector complains of neglect or dilatoriness and the remedy afforded by a complaint to the Superintending Engineer is not so effective as direct control.

5. I quite see the disadvantages attendant upon serving two masters, but it exists in other departments, such as the Forest and the Police, and does not, in my experience, give rise to much difficulty in practice. I should not even object to the

Superintending Engineer having power to overrule the Collector's order to the Executive Engineer to proceed to a place or to carry out a given work when the Superintending Engineer considers that the order cannot be complied with without detriment to his duties elsewhere or for other reasons, because it is not likely that Superintending Engineers would exercise such power without good grounds. All that I suggest is that the Collector should be empowered to issue orders to the Executive Engineer when he considers that that officer is unduly delaying to carry out work or that a case of urgency has arisen.

It will not, I believe, be denied by the superior officers of the Public Works Department that, in the past, in this district, there has been a want of energy and celerity in the disposal of work, and it is not unreasonable to think that, if the Collector had some power to direct the movements of the Executive Engineer, that want would not have been so conspicuously manifested.

ENCLOSURES.

(i)

Amur Korambu Head.

In this case the Divisional Officer submitted an estimate for Rs. 350 for the restoration of the old korambu head of the Amur channel on 8th July 1901 and it was sanctioned by the Collector from the Minor Irrigation grant in D. Dis. No. 1391, dated 14th July 1901, and on the oral representation by the Public Works Department to the then Collector, that the channel would silt in a short time, the work was ordered to be stopped. Before this order was passed, work to the amount of Rs. 188–11–4 was carried out and this sum was sanctioned. A reference was made to the Executive Engineer on 13th September 1901, requesting to take steps to have the work of restoring the old head done as an estimate was said to be ready for Rs. 2,090. As the work was not begun by the Public Works Department, the Tahsildar represented that the work of silt clearance might be done by the Revenue Department and thereupon the work for whole amount of Rs. 3,501 formerly sanctioned was ordered to be proceeded with. Again on 5th April 1902 a further sum of Rs. 112–0–1 was sanctioned by the Collector for the silt clearance, etc., work and the Executive Engineer was asked to report the stage at which the work promised to be done by them was and if it had not been commenced he was asked to state when it could be started. The Executive Engineer replied on 26th August 1902 that the estimate for Rs. 2,050 for the work had been submitted to the Superintending Engineer for sanction. Nothing was heard of it till 30th April 1904 (for one year and 19 months), when the Executive Engineer forwarded for remarks an estimate and requested to be informed of the then state of the korambu channel. After receiving a report from the Divisional Officer, the Executive Engineer was requested on 2nd July 1904 to forward the estimate to the Superintending Engineer for early sanction. Again nothing was heard of on the subject till the end of 1905, when the Divisional Officer brought it to the Collector's notice. To a reference made to the Executive Engineer on 9th January 1906 that officer stated on 20th January 1906 that the estimate had been sent to the Superintending Engineer who in his turn submitted it to the Chief Engineer for sanction. The Collector after inspecting the locality on 1st March 1906 brought to the Superintending Engineer's notice the delay that had occurred in this and several other cases, to which that officer replied that the estimate would be sanctioned during the work season. Again on 21st August 1906 the Collector asked the Executive Engineer to state whether the work was started and on receipt of his reply dated 18th September 1906 to the effect that the work would be done during the next drought, the Superintending Engineer has been addressed on 23rd September 1906 inviting his attention to the former references in detail. Reply has not yet been received.

(ii)

Construction of a dam in the Mamundiyar river to divert water to the Samudram tank, Kulittalai taluk.

On reference made from this office on 2nd July 1902 E. C. No. 1485/Rev., the Executive Engineer reported on 28th August 1902 that the Supervisor, Kulittalai, was being instructed to take the necessary levels for the construction of a dam across the Mamundiyar and wanted to know whether there would be any objection to do so as he had been informed that there was some agreement to that effect. He was informed on 16th December 1902 that there was no such agreement as surmised by him and that the dam might be constructed (R.D. 1005/02).

2. The ryots of Samudram presented a petition on 23rd September 1903 that the repairs to the tank had not been executed for a long time. This was forwarded to the Executive Engineer on 25th September 1903 with a request to report the steps taken in the matter. The Executive

Engineer replied on 29th October 1903 to the effect that levels and surveys had been taken for the preparation of the estimate for the restoration of the anicut and wanted certain further information in connection with the extension of irrigation from the tank. A reply was sent to him on 9th February 1904 (R.D. 92/04).

3. The ryots of Samudram appear to have again petitioned the Collector on 2nd August 1904 and also the Executive Engineer on 22nd February 1904 in respect of the repairs of the Mamundiyar anicut. The former was forwarded to the Executive Engineer with other papers and statement of the ryots of the village consenting to contribute four-fifths of the cost of repair to the tank, with a request to have an estimate prepared therefor on 20th October 1904 (R.D. 910/04).

4. The Executive Engineer replied on 4th November 1904 that an estimate would be prepared and submitted for sanction soon (R.D. 956/04).

5. The ryots of Samudram again presented a petition to the Collector in August 1906 while he camped at Samudram. The Executive Engineer was requested on 1st October 1906 to state why the works had not been carried out. The Executive Engineer has replied that it has been pending with the Sectional Officer, Kulittalai, from April 1905, that he has called for all the papers and that he will make a personal inspection and report.

(iii)

Repairs to be done to the Tirutalaiyur tanks, Musiri taluk.

A petition was received on 5th November 1901 from the ryots of the village of Tirutalaiyur, Musiri taluk, requesting that the tanks of the village might be repaired. It was forwarded to the Deputy Collector and from him to the Tahsildar, Musiri, for report. The Tahsildar forwarded it to the Public Works Department Supervisor at Musiri, for remarks on 3rd December 1901. The Supervisor replied on 5th December 1901 that an estimate for Rs. 4,950 was sanctioned for the work in question treating it as a Famine relief work and also that special estimates were called for for tanks in need of urgent repair, that levels could not be taken then owing to existence of water in the tank and that the necessary repairs would be done before the close of the year. The petitioners were informed accordingly and the file closed (D. Dis. No. 163/Rev. 02).

2. The ryots above referred to renewed their petition on 2nd June 1902. It was forwarded to the Executive Engineer on 9th June 1902 for report as to the steps taken in the matter with a copy of the Public Works Department Supervisor's letter dated 5th December 1901. The Executive Engineer reported on 31st August 1903 that an estimate for Rs. 5,975 for the repair of the big and small tanks in Tirutalaiyur had been submitted to the Superintending Engineer for sanction on 6th June 1903. The ryots were accordingly informed (D.D. No. 1852/03).

3. The villagers again presented a petition about the matter on 25th October 1906. The Executive Engineer was addressed thereon on 4th November 1906 and he has reported, on 29th November 1906, that an estimate for repairs to the tank amounting to Rs. 4,850 was sanctioned and work to the extent of Rs. 3,616 carried out and that it is believed to be practically completed, and has promised to send a further report.

(iv)

Alangudi channel bridge.

At the instance of the ryots of Inam Komagudi village, Trichinopoly taluk, who put in a petition in April 1904, requesting that a new wooden dam might be put up across the Alangudi channel, a branch of the Panguni channel, for diverting water into the irrigation channel, also a branch of the Panguni and that a bridge over the Tinniyam and Alangudi channels be constructed and the Divisional Officer was asked to report on the matter. On receipt of a report from the Divisional Officer on the petition, the Executive Engineer was addressed on 18th September 1904 to put up a wooden dam as requested by the Komagudi ryots. As regards the second prayer the Divisional Officer was asked to take steps as President of the Taluk Board for the construction of the channel, as it has to be provided in the road between Puvalur and Alangudi. The Executive Engineer, to whom a reference had been made, was not in favour of the dam sought to be put up. Please see his letters No. 449, dated 26th March 1906, and No. 723 M., dated 10th May 1906. As the Local Fund Engineer had prepared a design for the bridge proposed to be constructed over the Tinniyam and Alangudi channels, the Executive Engineer wanted that design to be sent to him for verification as to the sufficiency of waterway. Thereupon the design referred to was sent to the Executive Engineer with this office letter No. 915, dated 13th July 1906, and it has not as yet been received back. Three reminders on 14th September 1906, 16th October 1906 and 17th November 1906 were issued to that officer and in the last one he has informed that the work of constructing the bridge would be proceeded with on the original design, unless he sent a reply without delay. To this the Executive Engineer has in his letter No. 2043, dated 14th December 1906, stated that the matter is pending with the Local Fund Engineer to whom a reference appears to have been made on the 16th October 1906. In this case the first reference was made to the Executive

Engineer on 18th September 1904 and his first reply was received only on 26th March 1906. The work of constructing the bridge could not be proceeded with as the design has not been returned by the Executive Engineer.

(v)

Construction of groynes near the Musiri-Nattuvoikkal korambu head.

In February 1903, the ryots owning lands under this channel brought to the notice of the Collector that it had been proposed by the Public Works Department to construct some groynes in the Cauvery to prevent the erosion of the Salem road by the floods of the river and objected to the work on the ground that it would interfere with korambu head of the channel situated close by. The Divisional Officer, Musiri, supported the ryots and the papers were sent to the Executive Engineer for remarks on 8th July 1903. That officer replied, on the 21st July 1903, that the work proposed would not affect the korambu head and that it was necessary for the preservation of the river margin. The Executive Engineer's view was communicated to the ryots concerned. In August 1904 the ryots of Peramur, one of the villages under this channel irrigation, sent up a telegram to the Collector to the effect that the work was being carried out by the Public Works Department and objected to the same. The Divisional Officer was of opinion that the work would affect the channel head and so the Executive Engineer was again addressed on 1st September 1904, asking him to state whether no other arrangement was possible. The Executive Engineer replied, on 2nd November 1904, that he would inspect the place and report the result and that he has ordered an estimate to be prepared for a stone revetment instead of the groynes. No reply having been received until 24th July 1905, a reminder was sent. Thereupon the Sub-Divisional Officer's report stating that proposals had been made to shorten the length of the groynes and arrangements were being made was communicated by the Executive Engineer on 29th July 1905. The Divisional Officer, Musiri, was asked to give his opinion in the matter and he in his No. 1981, dated 18th September 1905, replied that there was no objection then, but that it was not possible to say anything as to the effect of the new construction as there had been no proper flood in that year and that he would report if any difficulty was felt later on. In January 1906 the Divisional Officer brought to the notice of the Collector that the ryots strongly objected to the construction of groynes however small and recommended that nanal plantation might be adopted instead. The Executive Engineer, to whom a reference was again made on 29th January 1906, stated on 17th February 1906 that the small groynes already put up would not affect the korambu head and that a final reply would be sent after fresh levels were taken. The Collector inspected the spot at the end of February 1906 and suggested the immediate demolition of the groynes. He recommended, however, that the bank might be revetted in the places eaten out by the floods. The present Executive Engineer on inspection agreed with the Collector and stated that *modassal work* would be put up as a temporary measure and that the question of providing permanent protection to the bank would be dealt with. The Executive Engineer finally proposed on 1st August 1906, that the stone groynes might be extended so as to suit the inclinations to the current and a new groyne be constructed as these would not affect the korambu head. The Superintending Engineer approved of the above in his No. 1483, dated 27th September 1906 (the Deputy Collector has been asked to report again if undue delay occurs in having the work carried out). Thus the correspondence has been going on since February 1903.

This is also a work for which the Public Works Department have provided in their budget for 1907–1908 a sum of Rs. 1,960.

(vi)

Kottai Vaikkal, Mekkudi.

In the year 1902 the ryots of Mekkudi village presented a petition bringing to notice the damages caused by the submersion of their lands owing to the floods in the Kottai vaikkal and the Kodingal and complaining that much silt had accumulated in the former and that it had no embankments. This was referred to the Executive Engineer and a copy of his letter to the Superintending Engineer, dated 29th February 1904, seemed to show that steps had been taken by the Public Works Department to reduce the damages complained of. As however the main complaint remained apparently undisposed of, the ryots put in another petition on the subject in November 1904 and on receipt of the Divisional Officer's report, dated 16th January 1905, the Executive Engineer was requested on 20th January 1905 to state whether any steps were taken towards repairing the Kottai vaikkal. The Executive Engineer replied on 20th June 1905 that the Kottai vaikkal is not borne on the list of the Imperial Irrigation works. In their petition the ryots had also complained about the erection of a dam across the Kottai vaikkal by the lower villagers and as the Executive Engineer's letter above referred to did not touch this point, that officer's attention was drawn to it in this office letter dated 30th June 1905. The Executive Engineer's reply showed that the erection of a new dam would be detrimental to the interests of the upper ryots but he had asked on 5th February 1906 to be furnished with the plan, etc., for the work if any had been sanctioned by the Revenue Department

to enable him to give a final opinion. Thereupon the Collector inspected the channel, etc., in the beginning of March 1906, brought to the notice of the Engineer the delay that has taken in the matter and requested him on 6th March 1906 to give his opinion in regard to the existence of the mud dam, making at the same time certain suggestions to remedy the grievances complained of. As regards the silt clearance the Collector asked the Divisional Officer to have it done by kudimaramat by the Mekkudi ryots, who took objection to this, however, on the ground that the Kottai vaikkal is not their irrigation channel. The Executive Engineer was thereupon requested on 1st September 1906 to decide the question as to whether he is prepared to have the silt clearance work done at the cost of Public Works Department. After three reminders, he has since replied that the ryots have produced some previous records on the subject and that the reference will be disposed of shortly.

(vii)

Kodingal, a drainage channel in the Trichinopoly taluk.

There are no proper embankments for this channel in several places. It is an irrigating source also to some villages. During the high floods in the year 1903, the banks breached and caused great damage to the wet lands and the crops thereon, and complaints received from the ryots by the Tahsildar were all forwarded to the Public Works Department officers, who inspected the places and replied that necessary action would be taken. In 1904, the ryots again represented that nothing had been done and the Public Works Department, in a reference in respect of the Mekkudi channel, stated in 1905 that this drainage channel would be taken up as soon as the Nangavaram drainage work was over. In September 1905, the Tahsildar submitted a report bringing to notice the great damage caused by this drainage channel. The Executive Engineer was addressed on 21st October 1905 with a view to making arrangements for closing the breaches and strengthening the embankments complained of. Nothing appears to have been done, but from a correspondence that passed between this office and the Public Works Department it appears that the Superintending Engineer promised to send a report to the Chief Engineer by the end of July 1905. The matter appears to be under detailed investigation at present.

(viii)

Kannappady Tank, Musiri taluk.

The ryots presented a petition regarding the repairs to be done to the tank and on a reference to the Executive Engineer it was reported in his letter No. 290 M., dated 22nd November 1903, that a reply would be sent on receipt of the Sub-Divisional Officer's report. An endorsement was given to the ryots accordingly. Nothing had been done till September 1904 when the ryots again put in another petition and it was sent to the Executive Engineer on 22nd September 1904 with reference to his former letter. In the beginning of May 1906 another representation was received from the villagers to the effect that in consequence of the tank not having been repaired, great loss was being incurred by them by deficiency of water-supply to the tank. In his letter No. 1134, dated 27th July 1906, the Engineer stated that an estimate for Rs. 3,590 had been sent to the Superintending Engineer. The former has again called for certain information and financial statement on 18th September 1906 and the Musiri Deputy Collector has been asked to furnish them. In this connection it may be mentioned that provision has been made by the Public Works Department in their budget for 1907–1908 for constructing sluices at a cost of Rs. 1,200 and for repairing the bund, etc., at a cost of Rs. 6,600.

(ix)

Ponneri channel head, Udaiyarpalayam taluk.

In the year 1888, the ryots of certain villages in the Udaiyarpalayam taluk owning lands under the Ponneri channel put in a mahazar requesting to have the korambu head of this channel shifted to a place higher up on the ground that the present head is not a suitable one to admit of a regular supply of water being diverted into the channel. On getting a report from the Divisional Officer, Ariyalur, it was proposed to have the work done by the Revenue Department at a cost of Rs. 2,430 from the balance of the Irrigation Cess fund in favour of the channel. The estimate was forwarded to the Superintending Engineer for remarks on 17th November 1888, and that officer replied on 18th May 1889, stating that the design sent by the Revenue Department was not suitable and that the Executive Engineer had been asked to take surveys and prepare an estimate. In July 1889 an estimate for Rs. 8,555 was received from the Superintending Engineer. As the available balance under the Irrigation Cess was only Rs. 3,066 the Superintending Engineer was asked to reduce the amount, but that officer expressed his inability to do so (letter No. 587, dated 4th October 1889). Further correspondence with the Public Works Department shows that the Sub-Divisional Officer in his letter dated 9th December 1890 recommended the restoration of the old head, but that the Superintending Engineer in his letter dated 8th April

1891 stated that it was not advisable to have the work done (at present). The ryots had been often complaining bitterly about the bad condition of this korambu and when they represented the matter in 1903, the Superintending Engineer stated in his letter No. 1381, dated 30th March 1904, that the matter was under consideration and that there was no need at present for it. Again on receipt of several petitions and mahazars in 1905 the Collector inspected the place and forwarded certain proposals to the Executive Engineer on 12th December 1905 in respect of the transfer of the korambu head. In the meantime the ryots submitted a mahazar on the subject to the Board of Revenue and it was forwarded to the Collector for disposal. The present Executive Engineer has inspected the channel from its head to its tail end and made an elaborate report to the Superintending Engineer on 16th October 1906 and forwarded a copy of it to the Collector. He has agreed to the Collector's proposals in the main, but before carrying out the work he suggested that complete investigation should be made in respect of the scheme and that estimates should be framed. He has applied for the entertainment of a special establishment for the purpose seeing that this channel system is the most backward in this district. The scheme is still pending.

(x)

Railway-affecting Tanks.

In accordance with the instructions contained in Board's Proceedings, No. 427, dated 27th October 1904, and No. 265, dated 30th November 1904, directing that the headmen of the villages in which railway-affecting tanks are situated should carry timely warning to the nearest Railway stationmaster when they are in danger of breaching and that for this purpose the village headmen concerned should be furnished with a list of such tanks in consultation with the Railway department, the Agent, South Indian Railway, was requested in this office letter dated 11th March 1905 to have the lists (prepared by the Tahsildars) verified and returned to the Collector. On receipt of an intermediate reply from the Agent in regard to the supply of a revised list of such tanks by the Superintending Engineer, the latter was requested on 25th July 1905 to send a copy of the list to the Agent and also one to the Collector's office. Five reminders were sent to the Superintending Engineer since then and he replied in a letter, dated 25th August 1906, that the list received from the Executive Engineer was under scrutiny in his office and it could not be completed before December 1906. It has not as yet been received. The Agent has since sent a reminder and the Superintending Engineer's attention has been invited on 6th January 1907 to his letter dated 25th August 1906 above noted. The matter is important and the early issue of the list is advisable.

(xi)

Koppu sluice, etc.

One M. Vaidyanatha Aiyar presented a petition to the Collector in February 1900 praying for the opening of a new sluice and channel from the Uyyakkondan for the irrigation of his wet lands and it was referred to the Divisional Officer for disposal on 16th February 1900. The Divisional Officer sent the petition to the Tahsildar of Trichinopoly and after some correspondence with the Public Works Deparatment Sub-Divisional Officer, the matter, it would appear, was referred to the Executive Engineer. Later on some correspondence appears to have been going on between the petitioner and the officers of the Public Works Department. The result was that the Public Works Department approved of the scheme on the report of the Tahsildar in 1902 and also framed an estimate for Rs. 1,300 and that the petitioner also promised to contribute one-fourth of it; but in the last endorsement given to the petitioner by the Superintending Engineer, No. 3082, dated 12th September 1905, it was stated "that the petitioner's request cannot be granted at any rate for the present". Thereupon the petitioner put in another petition to this office on the subject in the beginning of November 1905 and the same was referred to the Executive Engineer for remarks on 27th November 1905. That officer replied on 16th December 1905 that the matter would be gone into during the investigation of the Uyyakkondan channel and that the petitioner might bring up the question at that time. The Divisional Officer was asked on 6th January 1906 to report on the petition with the previous records and on receipt of his report the Executive Engineer was addressed on 23rd April 1906 with a view to arranging for a joint inspection of the locality in consultation with the Divisional Officer. After obtaining the Engineer's opinion, the Divisional Officer recommended in his letter No. 2029, dated 17th September 1906, the construction of the sluice and a channel at the cost of the petitioner so as to meet with the approval of the Executive Engineer subject to certain conditions. As the petitioner had agreed to the above before the Divisional Officer the Collector approved of the scheme and issued the necessary instructions in the matter on 4th October 1906. Thus the matter was closed. It will be seen that in spite of the favourable view taken by the Public Works Department at the outset in 1902–1903 the scheme was not sanctioned until the beginning of October 1906.

(xii)

Restoration of the Athuvaikkal, Trichinopoly taluk.

Athuvaikkal is the channel taking off the Coleroon (near Kukur village, Lalgudi division) to supplement the irrigation of the lands in certain villages under the Kaduvai, a drainage of the Ayyan channel. Owing to the channel having been silted up, the ryots contributed a sum of Rs. 1,197 in the year 1901 for restoring the channel. The Public Works Department carried out the work in part, viz., for Rs. 353–14–8, when it was thought by the Executive Engineer (*vide* his letter No. 18, dated 3rd November 1903) that the work would not be beneficial to the ryots and therefore a scheme was proposed to transfer the head of the channel higher up the river at a cost of Rs. 10,000 and he enquired whether the ryots would contribute half the cost. Enquiry was made through the Divisional Officer, and the Engineer was informed on 22nd March 1904 that the ryots were not willing to pay half the cost, but that they would contribute one-fourth *minus* the unspent balance of Rs 1,197 referred to above and at the same time the Engineer was requested to have the work carried out at Government cost. After some correspondence the ryots agreed to contribute 30 per cent. of the cost and the Superintending Engineer was addressed on the subject on 20th December 1904. The Superintending Engineer accepted the above proposal and stated on 16th January 1905 that the Executive Engineer has been asked to prepare estimates, etc., for the work. In his letter dated 22nd August 1905 the Executive Engineer stated that a fresh scheme for the work at a cost of Rs. 12,840 had been submitted to the Superintending Engineer and that fresh contribution would have to be collected for the same. He requested therein to arrange for the balance of the old contribution being refunded to the parties concerned. The Divisional Officer, who was requested to refund the amount, reported in his letter dated 18th October 1905 that the refund could not be made and suggested that the amount might be held in deposit against the 30 per cent. of the contribution of the revised estimate and on addressing the Executive Engineer on the point that officer accepted the proposal on 15th November 1905. On 16th December 1905 the Divisional Officer requested that the Public Works Department might be urged to carry out the scheme and the Executive Engineer was addressed on 27th December 1905 to state at what stage the scheme stood. The Executive Engineer replied in his letter No. 27-M., dated 5th October 1906, that the Superintending Engineer has not intimated his decision in the matter. Nothing further had been heard of it up to August 1906, when the Collector inspected the locality and made certain observations, and the matter is still pending.

(xiii)

Dam across the Srirangam Nattuvaikkal in Kilikkudu village.

The channel named above branches off the Cauvery for the irrigation of the lands in the village situated in the Srirangam Island. Kilikkudu is the last village under the channel. The ryots have been petitioning often to construct a dam across the channel to prevent the damage caused to their lands. The matter was referred to the Executive Engineer in 1899 and that officer stated that the work would be taken up and dealt with in the estimate for the improvements to the channel and that it would be attended to after more urgent works had been estimated for. An endorsement was given to the petitioners in February 1899. In May 1900 the ryots again put in a petition and to a reference made to the Public Works Department the Executive Engineer replied on the 13th December 1900 that an estimate for Rs. 700 had been submitted to the Superintending Engineer for sanction. As nothing was done till February 1902 another petition was received from the ryots and the Engineer's attention was invited to the previous correspondence. He replied in his letter, dated 16th December 1902, that the estimate was not sanctioned, that some other works would be taken up first and that a fresh estimate for a cheap dam would be prepared. In March 1903 again the ryots pressed for the execution of the work and as usual a reference was made to the Executive Engineer, who stated in July 1903 that sanction had been received for the work of constructing a regulating bridge and that the work would be carried out soon after the flood subsided. The Executive Engineer was requested on 29th October 1903 to attend to the work soon. Nothing further appears to have been done by the Public Works Department until 9th April 1905 when a petition was put in by the mirasidars. In reply the Executive Engineer reported on 20th November 1905 that an estimate for the dam would be sent up to the Superintending Engineer for sanction. The petitioners were given an endorsement to the above effect. In the month of August last (1906) two petitions were again presented and they have been referred to the Executive Engineer. Reply has not yet been received.

(xiv)

Nangavaram drainage and Kattuvari.

At the instance of the Nangavaram villagers the Public Works Department contemplated providing means of drainage for the surplus water of the village and also the Kattuvari flood water through the Kodingal (also a drainage channel) in the Trichinopoly taluk by an under-tunnel.

The ryots of the villages of Pulivalam, etc., in the Trichinopoly taluk objected to the scheme and presented a petition to the Collector in April 1900. The Executive Engineer was asked to offer his remarks thereon on 13th July 1900 and that officer reported on 20th August 1900 that he would address the Collector again on the matter after two months. The promised reply not having been received in spite of several reminders, the Executive Engineer's attention was drawn on 3rd October 1901 to the delay of more than a year. His reply was received on 14th November 1901. As he stated that there could be no objection to carry out the proposal, the Divisional Officer, Trichinopoly, was requested to report on the objection of the Pulivalam, etc., villagers, and his report was received on 12th December 1901. It was communicated to the Executive Engineer and he was asked to take into consideration a suggestion by the Divisional Officer before his (Executive Engineer's) proposal was carried out. The Executive Engineer reported in his letter, dated 29th January 1902, that the site for the under-tunnel was a favourable one but that he would report further as to whether the Divisional Officer's suggestion was practicable. The Engineer was thereupon asked on 12th May 1902 to state what was proposed to be done in the matter before obtaining sanction for the work. A special reference was made to the above officer on 17th September 1903, as his reply had not been received till then, although 12 reminders had been sent in the *interim*. On the 28th idem the Executive Engineer requested to be furnished with the area in the villages bordering on the Kodingal that might be liable to submersion, and it was furnished on 8th December 1903. An intermediate reply was received on 5th August 1904 from the Executive Engineer stating that the Superintending Engineer's orders were expected. The Superintending Engineer approved of the proposal of the Executive Engineer in the matter of constructing the under-tunnel on the condition of the interested ryots paying a contribution and directed that an estimate for strengthening the bank of the Kattuvari should be framed. The Executive Engineer enquired if the ryots were prepared to pay contribution and he was informed on the 4th October 1904 that they were willing to pay one-fourth of the cost which was estimated roughly at Rs. 2,500. In December 1904 a mahazar was presented to the Collector and the Board of Revenue objecting to the extension of the Kodamurutti bridge and to the diversion of Nangavaram, etc., surplus water into the Kodingal, and they were forwarded to the Superintending Engineer on 7th January 1905, for favour of remarks. On a similar petition presented to the Chief Engineer, the Superintending Engineer submitted a report on the 23rd March 1905 and another on the 22nd May 1905, copies of which were received in this office. In the latter part of his second report the Superintending Engineer stated that a reply would be sent regarding the Nangavaram Kattuvari and the Kodingal by the end of July 1905. In the memorandum proposed to be submitted by the mirasidars on the occasion of His Excellency the Governor's visit in October 1905, the drainage channel formed one of the subjects. The Superintending Engineer stated that he could not give any definite opinion until complete levels had been taken, but he doubted if any material improvement would be possible at any reasonable expense.

(xv)

Tottiyam Periya vaikkal and Srinivasanallur channel, Musiri taluk.

Two or three years ago there occurred a breach at the head of the korambu for the Tottiyam Periya vaikkal, and the attention of the Public Works Department was invited to it. The padugai portion to the south bank of the channel was washed away. The padugai at the head of the Srinivasanallur channel also was washed away. The Deputy Collector in his letter, dated 19th October 1905, brought these defects to the notice of the Executive Engineer. Apparently nothing was done till 11th March 1906 when the Deputy Collector reported the matter to the Collector and requested that the Public Works Department might be addressed so that the estimate said to have been under preparation might be got sanctioned urgently and the work entrusted to the Kattuputhur mittadar for execution in the summer season. The Deputy Collector's letter was forwarded to the Executive Engineer on 17th March 1906. The Collector, after inspecting the places in the beginning of October, addressed the Executive Engineer on the 16th October 1906 on the points involved. From a copy of the Supervisor's letter dated 1st December 1906 since received from the Executive Engineer it appears that an estimate for Rs. 1,540 for the above is in progress. As regards the breach in the Tottiyam Chinna vaikkal near Silapillaputhur it is reported that the work will have to be done when the portion of the leading channel is restored for which an estimate is lying in the Executive Engineer's office.

(xvi)

Providing a feeder channel from the Ariyar to the Tayanur tank, Trichinopoly taluk.

The ryots of Tayanur presented a petition to the Collector on 23rd November 1903 requesting to provide a feeder channel to their tank from the Ariyar. This was forwarded to the Executive Engineer for remarks on 24th November 1903. He reported thereon and requested certain further information on 30th November 1904. After much correspondence and elaborate enquiries the

information asked for by the Executive Engineer was furnished on 26th April 1906 with a request to report on certain points in respect of the lands lower down the Ariyar and also to scrutinize the estimate for the work prepared by the Minor Irrigation Overseer and to have a professional estimate prepared. Five reminders have been sent.

(xvii)

Sluice to the Appananallur tank, Musiri taluk.

There were formerly two sluices to this tank. This tank breached in 1898 and in consequence sluice No. 1 was damaged. On the representation of the village munsif and the ryots in 1901 and 1902 the Divisional Officer recommended, in his letter R. Dis. No. 127, dated 20th June 1902, the restoration of the sluice. The Public Works Department had already made a report to the Divisional Officer on 20th February 1902. The Collector, however, desired the Executive Engineer on 1st July 1902 to make a local inspection. In his reply, dated 18th October 1902, addressed to the Collector after inspection the Executive Engineer suggested the construction of a new sluice. To this the ryots took objection and they insisted on the reconstruction of the damaged sluice No. 1. Again the Executive Engineer in his letter dated 5th June 1903 pointed out the undesirability of reconstructing the sluice as desired by the ryots. This was explained to the ryots and they again adhered to their former request. The Deputy Collector's letter dated 7th July 1903 in respect of the above was communicated to the Executive Engineer on 13th July 1903. The question of providing another sluice not having been finally disposed of, the Musiri Deputy Collector on the representation of the ryots enquired in his letter dated 2nd July 1905 whether the Executive Engineer has settled the question as to the locality in which the sluice should be constructed, and the Executive Engineer's attention was invited on 2nd August 1905 to the reference dated 13th July 1903 and he has been asked to report on the matter. Five reminders have been sent. The Executive Engineer has sent an intermediate reply on the 18th December 1906 stating that the foundation of the weir could not be examined nor trial pits dug in the bed on account of the full supply in the tank.

(xviii)

Tirunedunkulam, Manganam and Valaivandankottai tanks, Trichinopoly taluk.

The ryots of Tirunedunkulam village brought to the notice of the Collector in April 1903 that no repairs had been done to their big tank for several years. The petition was forwarded to the Superintending Engineer for favour of necessary action on 6th April 1903 inviting his attention to the fact that a sum of Rs. 800 had been provided in the Public Works budget for 1903–1904. The Executive Engineer reported to the Superintending Engineer on the 8th May 1903 that the estimate would be sent up by the end of May 1903. In December 1905 and April 1906 the ryots complained again that their tank is in need of repairs, that the supply to the tank has been diminished by the diversion of the surplus of the Valaivandankottai tank and that some of the lands are submerged owing to the closure of the natural ground escape, etc., of the Manganam tank in 1903. The above complaints were referred to the Divisional Officer in the first instance for report and that officer suggested that a Public Works Department officer be deputed to make a joint inspection. The Executive Engineer was addressed by the Collector accordingly on 11th April 1906 and the former deputed the Sub-Engineer for the purpose. On the receipt of the Divisional Officer's final report in the matter on 16th June 1906 the Executive Engineer was addressed on 6th July 1906 to carry out at an early date such of the repairs as might seem necessary with a view to remedy the defects complained of. The three tanks mentioned above are all in the charge of the Public Works Department. The Executive Engineer's reply dated 6th August 1906 shows that certain information has been called for from the Overseer and the matter could be disposed of on receipt of it. The Executive Engineer has, in his letter No. 634, dated 16th November 1906, proposed certain repairs to the tanks and communicated a copy of it to us.

(xix)

Providing shutters to the drainage sluices in Panayakurichi village, Trichinopoly taluk.

On 30th March 1899 the ryots of the above village put in a petition to the Divisional Officer requesting that the drainage sluices might be provided with shutters and locks and keys, and it was referred to the Executive Engineer, who in his letter dated 7th May 1900 stated that an estimate for Rs. 135 for replacing the self-acting shutters had been sanctioned and sent to the Supervisor for execution. Nothing was done till the middle of May 1904 when the ryots again put in another petition on the subject. The Divisional Officer, to whom it was referred for remarks, brought to the Collector's notice the correspondence noted above and requested that the Public Works Department might be addressed again as it was reported by the Tahsildar that the work had not been done. Thereupon the Executive Engineer was written to by the Collector on

22nd August 1904 and that officer replied that a portion of the work had been done already and that orders have been issued for finishing the rest within one month. With this the matter appears to have dropped. In July 1906 the ryots complained to the Collector about the same matter. The Engineer's attention was invited to his former letter dated 8th September 1904 and the petition was forwarded to him for remarks on 1st August 1906. Reply has not yet been received. To a reminder sent on 14th November 1906 the Engineer has stated on the 16th December 1906 that the estimate received from the Section Officer has been returned for revision and that the work will be carried out soon.

(xx)

Kallur anikat, Musiri taluk.

There had been a dispute between the ryots of Amur and one Thandavaraya Pillai, a mirasidar of Kallur, for the last more than 15 years. On a reference made by the Musiri Deputy Collector regarding the dispute to the Executive Engineer on 21st December 1902, that officer suggested certain proposals in his letter dated 17th October 1903. In the meantime the Amur ryots put in a petition to the Collector on 16th October 1903 complaining that in consequence of the raising of the level of the surplus weir in their drainage channel by the Kallur mirasidar by putting up mud dams, their (Amur) lands had been submerged. The Divisional Officer, to whom the petition was sent for report, referred to the Executive Engineer's reply he had already received (above quoted) and the Deputy Collector was asked to advise both the parties to abide by the Engineer's opinion and to go to the Civil Court if they differed from that opinion. The Collector's order was communicated to the ryots concerned by the Divisional Officer. In October 1905 the Divisional Officer in his letter to the Executive Engineer (sent through the Collector) suggested that a sand escape might be provided for the dam across the Ayyar river in order to protect the Amur lands from submersion and a further report was received from that officer dated 12th November 1905. He reported that a joint inspection of the locality might satisfactorily solve the difficulty. The Executive Engineer was addressed thereupon on 25th November 1905, and his reply stated that he had arranged with the Deputy Collector for a joint inspection and that he would soon get necessary estimates made out for certain work. During his tour in March 1906 the Collector inspected the locality and suggested the provision of sand sluice on the right flank of the Ayyar dam. In his reply dated 31st May 1906 the Executive Engineer stated that the Superintending Engineer has disapproved of the Collector's proposal and a revised estimate was being prepared as per that officer's instructions and it would be ready shortly.

(xxi)

Musiri Mettuvaikkal, etc.

The irrigation channels (main) in the Musiri division not having been cleared of silt for several years by the Public Works Department, the Musiri Deputy Collector had the work done by the ryots in 1905 with the permission of the Executive Engineer promising them to pay for the work afterwards. Musiri Mettuvaikkal was one of those in which the work was carried out. He addressed the Executive Engineer on 20th June 1905 asking him to have the work check-measured by some officer of the Public Works Department and forwarded a copy of that letter to the Collector. The Deputy Collector was requested on 30th June 1905 to report whether the check-measurement had been done by the Public Works Department and whether the estimate for closing the breaches in the vari, etc., called for had been received. He reported on 4th July 1905 that the Sub-Divisional Officer had received orders for the preparation of the estimate and that in the meantime the breaches would be temporarily closed. Thereupon the Executive Engineer was written to by the Collector on 8th July 1905 to send the estimates wanted by the Deputy Collector. Six reminders have been sent from this office and an intermediate reply was received from the Executive Engineer on 5th September 1906 to the effect that the Sub-Divisional Officer has not submitted the estimate and has been called upon to explain the delay.

(xxii)

Visvambalsamudram supply channel, Musiri taluk.

The above is the drainage channel of the Kottappalyam tank. In September 1904, the Executive Engineer forwarded to the Collector estimate and plans for Rs. 1,510 for repairing the channel and requested to have the work done by the Revenue Department. The Collector returned the estimate to the Executive Engineer on 13th September 1904 as the channel has been included in the list of Imperial irrigation works. Again the Executive Engineer returned the estimate on 28th September 1904 as the channel has been omitted from the list received from the Superintending Engineer. The Executive Engineer's attention was drawn on 6th October 1904 to the

fact that the work has been grouped with the Kottapalyam tank and he reported the matter to the Superintending Engineer and sent a copy of his letter to the Collector on 15th December 1904. In this he stated that the estimate would be completed on receipt of Superintending Engineer's orders. Seven reminders were sent. A reply was received from the Executive Engineer on the 21st November 1905 stating that it has been decided by the Superintending Engineer that the work is an Imperial one and that fresh estimate based on levels have been called for. Later on the Sub-Divisional Officer to whom the papers had been referred by the Executive Engineer submitted a report to the latter wherein he has stated that it is a matter for consideration whether it is worthwhile to spend a large amount on this channel. In submitting the above to the Superintending Engineer, the Executive Engineer has stated on 20th March 1906 that ordinary repairs that may be required for the channel will be estimated for and the estimate duly disposed of. The matter has thus closed and it is not known what further has taken place.

(xxiii)

Culvert to the west of Kulittalai toll-gate.

The Local Fund Overseer, Kulittalai, brought to the notice of the Local Fund Engineer on 25th September 1905 the urgent repairs to be done by the Public Works Department to the culvert and the Local Fund Engineer addressed the Executive Engineer on 30th September 1905 on the matter. The Executive Engineer sent a reply on 17th October 1905 to the effect that an estimate for Rs. 500 has been got ready and that the work would be done soon after the water in the channel went down. A reference was made to the Executive Engineer from the District Board's office on the 13th October 1906 as nothing had been done by the Public Works Department. The Executive Engineer replied on 29th October 1906 that the estimate sent to the Superintending Engineer has been returned unsanctioned and that he would inspect the place and resubmit the estimate. The Superintending Engineer was addressed by the President, District Board, on the 22nd November 1906, to have early steps taken in the matter. In his letter No. 710, dated 17th December 1906, to the Superintending Engineer, the Executive Engineer has stated that the sluice (culvert) is unnecessary and that he would submit a final reply after obtaining certain particulars. A copy of the above letter was communicated to the President on the 18th December 1906 and a reply has been sent to the Executive Engineer requesting him to have sluice repaired at once so as to put the road in order. This work is of an urgent character as the culvert is on a main road and is in a dangerous state.

(xxiv)

Supply channel to the Tuthur big tank and drainage sluice, Udaiyarpalaiyam taluk.

In May 1896, the ryots of Tuthur put in a mahazar to the Collector requesting that a new channel might be opened from the Coleroon for the regular supply to their tank. On receipt of report from the Divisional Officer the Superintending Engineer was addressed in the matter on 4th September 1896. The latter promised on 29th January 1897 to send a final reply as soon as the Executive Engineer's report was received. In his letter No. 2073, dated 22nd November 1897, however, the Superintending Engineer stated that the diversion of the drainage passing into the Coleroon into the Tuthur tank would be a better supply and that he was making enquiries on the point. In May 1898 the Superintending Engineer stated that the best supply for the tank was by the construction of a new head sluice in the Coleroon with a supply channel and that the cost would approximate to Rs. 3,000. Then the Superintending Engineer was requested on 6th May 1898 to send plan and estimate. Nothing was heard from that officer till 28th April 1899 and the ryots put in another petition and an endorsement was given to them. A reference was again made on 18th July 1899 to the Superintending Engineer and he replied on 9th August 1899 that the Executive Engineer had been ordered to submit estimate, etc. In April and July 1900 the ryots put in petitions and they were forwarded to the Public Works Department. Again they presented a petition on 4th March 1901 and the Superintending Engineer was reminded several times. The last reminder was dated the 14th March 1902. In his memorandum to the Executive Engineer dated 25th March 1903 [copy communicated to the Collector) the Superintending Engineer ordered that it was not advisable to supply the tank by means of a channel and sluice from the Coleroon and that estimates should be prepared and submitted for diverting the drainage into the tank by closing the Telur gap. On a petition referred to the Executive Engineer, that officer reported in his letter dated 31st March 1903 that the provision of a proper supply channel from the Telur odai would be best investigated by the Public Works Department. Nothing was done till the end of December 1904 when one of the ryots complained to the Collector on the subject. The Executive Engineer was asked on 19th January 1905 to state what steps had been taken for repairing the channel, and he stated in the concluding paragraph of his letter No. 237-M., dated 14th February 1905, that the scheme of constructing the drainage sluice at Telur gap and the reconstruction of the old channel had been investigated, that an estimate for the former work had been submitted to the Superintending Engineer and that the latter would be considered on completion of the former. Petitioner was given an endorsement to the above effect.

Subsequent to the above, several petitions were received from one Guruswami Aiyar and endorsements were given to him between 8th June 1905 and 15th March 1906. He gave another petition on the latter date and the Executive Engineer reported thereon on 27th April 1906 that the estimate referred to above had been submitted to the Chief Engineer for sanction. Thus the question as to providing a supply channel to this tank remains unsettled since 1896.

Reference—No. 2412-*A* (*Confdl. No.* 61), *dated* 22*nd July* 1907.

Submitted to Government.

2. The Collector of Trichinopoly has instanced twenty-four cases of delay in the disposal of reference to the Public Works Department in his district, as indicating the unsatisfactory condition of the present system under which the Collector of the district is allowed no sort of control over the Executive Engineer. Such delays are not peculiar to the Trichinopoly district. Mr. Dance, the Collector of Chingleput, reported similar delays in 1903, and they were brought to the notice of the Superintending Engineer demi-officially by the Board. A reference to the last business statement received from the Collector of Chingleput shows eight references from the Revenue Department as pending with the Executive Engineer for more than a year, the oldest for over three years. Similar instances could be quoted from other districts.

3. The Collector's complaints of delays and want of co-operation on the part of the Public Works officers in Gódávari led to the rules issued in G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, to regulate the relation of Public Works officers to Collectors. But the case dealt with recently in G.O., No. 11 W., dated 7th January 1907, shows that rules, however well framed, can be ineffectual if the officers concerned have not their observance at heart.

4. The unsatisfactory state of affairs in Trichinopoly is due no doubt in part to the peculiar and inconvenient commingling of the functions of the Revenue and Public Works Departments described in paragraph 3 of Mr. Butterworth's letter, and the Board, in the Settlement Department, on the recommendation of a conference of officers of the two departments, has recently sanctioned arrangements which, as far as is practicable, will put an end to the system of dual control. But delay on the part of officers of the Public Works Department in the disposal of references and want of co-operation with the Revenue officials are not confined to the Trichinopoly district; while, as matters stand, Collectors being unable to bring any effective pressure to bear upon the Executive Engineers are powerless to prevent grave injury to the public interests.

5. In the Board's opinion the most effective remedy would be to subordinate the Executive Engineer to the Collector by making him a Personal Assistant to the Collector like the District Forest Officer and the Superintendent of Police. If this proposal does not commend itself to Government, some improvement would doubtless result from insisting on personal attention to and greater punctuality in the disposal of correspondence. The Board is not aware whether there are in the Public Works Department any rules corresponding to those laid down in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30. Such rules, if they exist and are observed, should suffice to ensure a reasonable despatch in business; in their absence it is impossible. Whatever be the rules on this subject in the Public Works Department, the Board would strongly recommend that the Executive Engineer be required to furnish to the Collector quarterly progress reports relating to all correspondence with the Revenue Department and that the Collector should review them and submit them through the Board to Government.

6. As a further indication of the Executive Engineer's position and duty, the Board would suggest that rule 3 of the rules regarding the relation of the Public Works Department officers to the Collector be so modified as to emphasize the fact that the Collector is the administrative head of the district and as such is entitled to the *assistance* (not mere co-operation) of the Executive Engineer.

A. R. LOFTUS-TOTTENHAM,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with the Collector's letter of 1st March 1907 and its enclosures.

Order—No. 1018 W., dated 23rd September 1910.

In his letter to the Board of Revenue, No. 12 (Confdl.), dated the 1st March 1907, the Collector of Trichinopoly (Mr. Butterworth) brought to notice twenty-four cases, in which references to the Public Works Department had long remained unanswered, as indicative of the unsatisfactory condition of the present system under which the Collector has no control over the Executive Engineer and suggested that the Collector should have some power conjointly with the Superintending Engineer to direct the movements of the Executive Engineer. In submitting this letter to the Government, the Board of Revenue observed that such delays were not peculiar to the Trichinopoly district, that the Collector of Chingleput (Mr. Dance) had reported similar delays in 1903 and that instances of the kind could be quoted from other districts also, and suggested that the most effective remedy would be to subordinate the Executive Engineer to the Collector by making him a Personal Assistant to the Collector like the District Forest Officer and the Superintendent of Police. In the event of this proposal not commending itself to Government the Board offered the following suggestions for securing an improvement in the disposal of correspondence: (1) that an arrear list should be maintained by the Executive Engineer as laid down in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30, for Revenue offices; (2) that the Executive Engineer should be required to furnish to the Collector quarterly progress reports relating to all correspondence with the Revenue Department, which the Collector should review and submit to the Government through the Board; and (3) that Rule 3 of the rules regarding the relation of the Public Works Department Officers to the Collector should be modified so as to emphasize the fact that the Collector is the administrative head of the district and as such is entitled to the *assistance* (not mere co-operation) of the Executive Engineer.

2. In the Appendix to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, certain rules were laid down regarding the relations of Public Works Department Officers to Collectors of districts. The present correspondence and that relating to the changes introduced into the system of distributing water for irrigation in the Gódávari delta dealt with in G.O., No. 2401, Revenue, dated 28th August 1908, has shown the need for amplifying these rules in some respects, and in reissuing them with the modifications referred to below the Government desire to lay particular stress upon the following considerations which should be continually borne in mind:—

(*a*) that the Superintending Engineer and the Executive Engineer should thoroughly understand that no important innovation or change in administration should be undertaken by them without informing the Collector fully on the subject;

(*b*) that the Collector has the right to obtain without delay any information he desires as regards the Public Works Department work in his district; and the Engineers should avoid delay in dealing with communications from the Collector which are marked as urgent or important.

(*c*) that the Collector should have power to *stop any important changes* in the existing order of things as regards distribution of water until the matter has been referred to the Government; and

(*d*) that the Collector should have the means of seeing whether his letters and references to the Public Works Department in his district are being properly attended to.

3. To give effect to these directions Rules 3 and 5 of the rules laid down in the Appendix to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, are amended as follows:—

Rule 3.—*Substitute* the following *for* the present Rule 3:—

"The Collector is the responsible head of the district, and the assistance and "professional advice of the Public Works Department are wholly at his disposal if "required. Any information he may call for should be promptly supplied. The "Collector may, for any special reason, issue any definite instruction to the Executive "Engineer. If the Executive Engineer considers that such instruction is not in the "public interests and if time allows, he may ask the Collector to refer the matter to "Government through the Superintending Engineer, and the Collector in that case "should at once do so. Otherwise the Collector's instructions shall be complied with."

Rule 5.—*Substitute* the following *for* the present Rule 5:—

"It is desirable that Superintending and Executive Engineers should, as much "as possible, consult Collectors and Divisional Officers personally in regard to the "Public Works interests and needs of the district, and all officers of the Public Works "Department should co-operate cordially and readily with the Revenue officers of the "district. All proposals for important changes in the distribution of water or in any "other branch of the Public Works administration should be forwarded to the Collector "for remarks before submission for sanction to the Superintending Engineer or to "Government, and the Collector should be furnished with information as to any such "changes decided upon before they are carried out."

4. The complete rules as now amended are printed as an annexure to this Order.

5. As suggested by the Board of Revenue, Executive Engineers should furnish Collectors with quarterly lists of unanswered references showing what steps have been taken to get the subject disposed of, and should maintain in their offices an arrear list similar to that prescribed in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30, for Revenue offices.

(True Extract.)

F. J. WILSON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Superintending Engineers.
,, the Revenue Department with copy of notes.

ANNEXURE TO G.O., No. 1018 W., DATED 23RD SEPTEMBER 1910.

Rules regarding the relation of Public Works Officers to Collectors of Districts.

In framing the District Public Works Budget, Superintending Engineers should invariably consult the Collectors concerned in sufficient time for thorough discussion of the proposed programme and with full explanation of the scope and object of the works included therein. If, in any case, Superintending Engineers are unable to adopt Collectors' suggestions, they should record their reasons for differing from the Collectors and submit the record to Government along with the budget. At the same time a copy of these reasons and a copy of the budget, as finally submitted by the Superintending Engineer to Government, should also be communicated to the Collector.

2. Works not provided for in the budget should not, except in cases of emergency, be commenced without the Collector's previous approval, and when so commenced, intimation should at once be given to him.

3. The Collector is the responsible head of the district, and the assistance and professional advice of the Public Works Department are wholly at his disposal if required. Any information he may call for should be promptly supplied. The Collector may, for any special reason, issue any definite instruction to the Executive Engineer. If the Executive Engineer considers that such instruction is not in the public interests, and if time allows, he may ask the Collector to refer the matter to Government through the Superintending Engineer, and the Collector in that case should at once do so. Otherwise the Collector's instructions shall be complied with.

4. The Collector should have the right to propose the construction of new works and the repairs of existing ones, and his proposal should be disregarded only for reasons to be recorded and communicated to him by the Superintending Engineer. The Collector may also make recommendations in regard to other Public Works matters which concern his district, and such recommendations shall be duly considered and promptly replied to.

5. It is desirable that Superintending and Executive Engineers should, as much as possible, consult Collectors and Divisional Officers personally in regard to the Public Works interests and needs of the district, and all officers of the Public Works Department should co-operate cordially and readily with the Revenue officers of the district. All proposals for important changes in the distribution of water, or in any other branch of the Public Works administration, should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission for sanction to the Superintending Engineer or to Government, and the Collector should be furnished with information as to any such changes decided upon before they are carried out.

6. Public Works officers will follow strictly in future the rule enjoining that no lands should be entered upon until formally transferred by the Revenue Department.

7. Superintending Engineers should themselves submit complete budget estimates of the requirements of all departments within the limits of their Circles, Executive Engineers of divisions obtaining from departments concerned the necessary information in regard to new works to be undertaken and the order of their urgency. Superintending Engineers will also assist the local heads of such departments with advice and information without delay when asked for, and in cases in which differences of opinion may exist, will discuss the matter fully with them.

CONFIDENTIAL.

18

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 1018 W., DATED 23RD SEPTEMBER 1910.

[SUBJECT.—*Relation of Public Works Officers to Collectors.*]

Previous papers :

G.O., No. 1753, *Revenue, dated 7th November* 1901.
" " 353 *W.* " 31*st January* 1902.
" " 2221, *Revenue* " 4*th September* 1907.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 2412-*A* (*Confdl. No.* 61), *dated* 22*nd July* 1907.

Under Secretary—

In January 1902 certain rules were issued by Government regarding the relation of Public Works officers to Collectors.

G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902.

2. In March last, Mr. Butterworth, Collector of Trichinopoly, brought to the notice of the Board 24 cases of delay in the disposal of references to the Public Works Department in his district, and suggested that, co-ordinately with Superintending Engineers, Collectors should have authority to issue orders to Executive Engineers in cases of urgency or undue delay. With reference to this suggestion, the Board points out that delay on the part of Public Works officers in the disposal of references and want of co-operation with the Revenue officials are not confined to the Trichinopoly district and that the rules of January 1902, however well framed, can be ineffectual if the officers concerned have not their observance at heart. The Full Board therefore suggests as the best remedy the subordination of the Executive Engineer to the Collector by making him a Personal Assistant to the Collector like the District Forest Officer and the Superintendent of Police. In the event of the above proposal not being accepted by Government, the Board recommends—

(1) that personal attention to and greater punctuality in the disposal of correspondence should be insisted on by framing rules similar to those in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30,* if such are not in force already in the Public Works Department;

* Check of arrears.

(2) that in any case Executive Engineers should be required to furnish Collectors with quarterly progress reports relating to all correspondence with the Revenue Department and that Collectors should review and submit them through the Board to Government; and

(3) that, as a further indication of the Executive Engineer's position and duty, rule 3 of the rules under G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, should be so modified as to emphasise the fact that the Collector is the administrative head of the district and as such is entitled to the *assistance* of the Executive Engineer, not mere co-operation as stated in rule 5.

3. It is submitted that the Board's proposals may be forwarded to the Public Works Department u.o. for remarks.

G.A.V.
3-8-07.

Secretary—

D. T. Chadwick.
7-8-07.

Please put up No. 1753, Revenue, dated 7th November 1901, and notes to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, or the original Government Order.

A. G. Cardew.
10-8-07.

Under Secretary—

The Government Orders are submitted.

G.A.V.
13-8-07.

Secretary—

D.T.C.
14-8-07.

The original of G.O., No. 1369 W., dated 17th May 1901, must clearly be put up.

A.G.C.
14-8-07.

Under Secretary—

Submitted.

G.A.V.
23-8-07.

Secretary—

D.T.C.
24-8-07.

The Board proposes that the Executive Engineer should be subordinated to the Collector and made a Personal Assistant to him like the District Forest Officer and the Superintendent of Police. In the first place it should be observed that there is a marked difference between the positions of the District Forest Officer and the District Superintendent of Police. The District Forest Officer at present is required to send all correspondence (except on minor matters and routine) *in the name of the* Collector and *through* the Collector; the District Forest office is a branch of the Collector's office, and the Collector corresponds with the District Forest Officer by office-note. If the Board of Revenue intends to suggest that the Executive Engineer should be placed in a position similar to that of the District Forest Officer, the proposal is, I think, absurd. It would lead to hopeless congestion of work and to far greater delays than are now the cause of the suggestion. The District Superintendent of Police, on the other hand, though he is stated in Police Order No. 12 (*d*) to be the District Magistrate's Assistant for Police purposes, is largely an independent officer. He corresponds direct and in his own name with the Deputy Inspector-General and other officers, and the only correspondence of his which goes through the District Magistrate is the diary. If the Board means that the Executive Engineer should to this extent be declared to be the Collector's Assistant for Public Works purposes, no great change would be introduced. Procedure would go on as at present. The rules already lay down that the *advice* of the Public Works Department is wholly at the Collector's disposal and that he is to be supplied promptly with any information he may desire. The change would be

Sections 220, 221 and 226 of Madras Forest Code.

Correspondence between the District Superintendent of Police and the District Magistrate is conducted u.o. in every properly-regulated District Magistrate's office, and the District Superintendent of Police has to keep the District Magistrate constantly informed of the state of grave crime and partly by his *oral* interviews and partly by his diaries. And of course he consults his District Magistrate in all very serious and exceptional cases of grave crime.

G. S. F[orbes].
2-1-08.

How little he knows.
G.S.F.

Rule 3 in appendix to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902.

one of name, and delays would still be possible where there is want of due control. Rule 3 might perhaps be amended so as to introduce the words "assistance and" before the words "professional advice", but it will still be necessary to see that individual officers shall enforce punctuality and businesslike conduct of correspondence. No change in the rules will obviate that necessity.

2. The more practical proposals of the Board are—

(1) that rules like those in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30, should be laid down and enforced in the Public Works Department, unless they exist already;

(2) that quarterly lists of unanswered references should be sent by Executive Engineers to the Collector who should review them and submit them through the Board to Government.

The file may now go to Public Works Department for remarks at this stage.

A.G.C.
26–8–07.

Public Works Department.

Secretary—

It is submitted that the note in the Revenue Department *supra* states the case quite fairly, and that there is no objection to the insertion of the words "assistance and" before the words "professional advice" in the existing rules. The suggestions (1) and (2) above of the notes may also be adopted with advantage.

I have made specific recommendations for improved office procedure in subordinate offices, in connection with the Establishment Committee's report and, if effect is given to those recommendations, it would be next to impossible for references of any kind to be overlooked, and it would be quite simple to fix responsibility for neglect.

R. Parsons.
29–8–07.

The question relates largely to irrigation work. I forward the papers therefore to the Joint Secretary, Irrigation Branch, for such remarks as he has to offer.

F. J. Wilson.
29–11–07.

Public Works Department
(Irrigation Branch).

The list of delays as forwarded by Mr. Butterworth looks formidable until one comes to analyse them. It will, however, be found that in many cases there is no delay at all; a course of action having been adopted and fresh petitions received in consequence—no unusual circumstance in any department. In other cases delay is ascribed because the Superintending Engineer found himself unable to comply with the Collector's suggestions.

Not quite in accordance with my note or the scope of a Secretary's powers.

A.G.C.
6–12–07.

The Revenue Secretary having declined to consider the proposal that the Executive Engineer should be made an Assistant to the Collector, I need not note on this point, but if the question should be again revived, I should like to have an opportunity of doing so.

I hold that Executive Engineers and Superintending Engineers should give every possible assistance to Collectors and comply with their wishes unless there are good reasons for not doing so. In such cases they should always be clearly explained. It may be pointed out that questions of repair and alterations to existing irrigation works, apparently simple, often turn out to be very complicated, and it is better that they should be well considered than hastily carried out on wrong lines. There is

however, no doubt that sometimes delays which are unnecessary do occur. I have no objection to the suggestion of the Revenue Secretary at page 3 of the notes.

H. E. CLERK.
28-11-07.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

I agree generally with the Revenue Secretary. The Revenue Board itself recognises the disadvantages of dual control in paragraph 4 of its letter, but the proposal made, so far as it can be understood, would increase the complexity of control and would have the grave disadvantage of tending to interfere with the regular chain of discipline. It would seem also to put upon the shoulders of the Collector, who is already a hard-worked official, duties and responsibilities which more properly belong to the Superintending Engineer. The Collector as administrative head of his district is naturally entitled to the full assistance, advice and co-operation of the Public Works officers. This is already enjoined by the spirit of the rules regulating the relation between Civil District officers and Public Works officers, but having regard to the representations made, the addition to the wording of the rules and the proposals made by the Revenue Secretary on page 3 of the notes for dealing with cases of unbusinesslike conduct of correspondence, on the part of individual officers may be adopted.

F.J.W.
28-11-07.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Under Secretary—

The three suggestions made by the Secretary, viz.—

(1) the insertion of the words "assistance and" before the word "professional" in rule 3 of G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902;

(2) the laying down and enforcement of rules like those in Board's Standing Order No. 165 (30);

(3) submission of quarterly lists of unanswered references from the Executive Engineer to Collector who will send them to the Board and Government;

have been accepted by both the Public Works Department and the Public Works (Irrigation) Department.

2. It is observed from page 3 of the notes that certain recommendations for improved office procedure in the subordinate offices of the Public Works Department are under consideration.

P.G.S.
3-12-07.

S.S.
4-12-07.

Secretary—

D.T.C.
5-12-07.

Honourable Member & Circ.—

In his letter dated 1st March 1907, Mr. Butterworth, Collector of Trichinopoly, submitted to the Board a list of 24 pending files indicative of delay in the disposal of business by the Public Works Department, and he suggested, rather with reference to the special conditions of the Trichinopoly district than as a general proposition, that the Collector should have authority, jointly with the Superintending Engineer, over the Executive Engineer. Mr. Butterworth did not define very clearly what measure of control over the Executive Engineer he would vest in the Collector, but apparently his idea was to empower the Collector to direct the Executive Engineer (1) to proceed to any given place and make an inspection, (2) to carry out a given work.

22

2. The Board of Revenue submits the Collector of Trichinopoly's letter to Government, and states that such delays as Mr. Butterworth instances are not peculiar to the Trichinopoly district, that similar delays occurred in Chingleput in 1903, and that the most effective remedy would be, in the Board's opinion, to subordinate the Executive Engineer to the Collector by making him a Personal Assistant to the Collector "like the District Forest Officer and the Superintendent of Police." If Government do not approve of this suggestion, the Board proposes (1) that rules similar to those in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30, should be laid down in the Public Works Department; (2) that the Executive Engineer should furnish the Collector with quarterly progress reports relating to all correspondence with the Revenue Department; (3) that rule 3 of the rules in G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, should be modified so as to emphasize the fact that the Collector is head of the district and entitled to the *assistance* of the Executive Engineer.

3. The file has been to the Public Works Department, and notes of the Chief Engineer and Chief Engineer for Irrigation will be found at page 4. They accept proposals (1), (2) and (3) made by the Board and enumerated in the last paragraph.

4. There remains, for consideration, the Board's proposal that the Executive Engineer should be subordinated to the Collector by making him a "Personal Assistant like the District Forest-officer and the Superintendent of Police." In my note dated 26th August 1907, at pages 2 and 3 *supra*, I have pointed out that this recommendation is not sufficiently clear, in that the position of the District Forest Officer in regard to the Collector is markedly different from that of the District Superintendent of Police. Since that note was written, the orders on the revised Forest Code have given the District Forest Officer slightly more independence, but his position remains very different from that of the District Superintendent of Police. The Board's proposal is thus wanting in definition, and in this matter it is, I submit, very desirable that proposals and decisions should be as clear and definite as possible. It is easy to talk of "putting the Public Works Department under the Collector," but if friction between the two departments and discontent in the Public Works Department, with resulting damage to public business, is to be avoided, any orders to be issued should be specific and not open to cavil and dispute.

5. Taking, first, the Board's analogy with the Forest Department, it is, I think, easy to show that the idea of placing the Executive Engineer *in the position of the District Forest Officer* is inappropriate. The two main classes of works dealt with by the Public Works Department are—(i) Buildings, (ii) Irrigation. It can hardly be, I think, that the Board has realized the full results of its own recommendation, for it is hardly possible to propose seriously that the Executive Engineer should be placed in the position of District Forest Officer with reference to the Collector in matters relating to *Buildings*. In dealing with buildings, the Executive Engineer corresponds with all other departments—Revenue, Judicial, Police, Jails, Registration, Education, and so on. If the correspondence regarding construction of, or alterations to, a District Munsif's Court, to a girls' school, or a police station, were all to be submitted to the Collector or carried on through him, or even if he were made responsible for what the Executive Engineer (as his Public Works Assistant) did in these matters, the burden laid on the Collector would, I submit, be intolerable. Already a Collector's lot is not altogether a happy one, but if all the control of that part of the Executive Engineer's work that relates to buildings is to be placed on the Collector, the poor man must, I submit, break down. Moreover it is difficult to believe that the concentration of the control in this matter in the Collector would lead to any useful result. If improved methods of correspondence are needed in the Public Works Department (and they do seem greatly to be needed), it is not necessary to kill the Collector with unnecessary work, in order to introduce them. Hence I submit that, so far as buildings are concerned, the Board's proposal to place the Executive Engineer in the position of the District Forest Officer is unnecessary, and that, so far at least as buildings are concerned, the Executive Engineer must continue to be independent of the Collector.

6. The other branch of the Executive Engineer's work, viz., *Irrigation*, is more closely connected with other portions of the Collector's duties, but even here it can hardly be proposed, I think, to bring *all* irrigation matters under the Collector's control. In such districts as Gódávari, Kistna, Guntúr, Tanjore, Ganjám, Nellore and Madura, there are large irrigation works, the management of which involves hydraulic questions with which Collectors are not generally qualified to deal. It would, I submit, obviously be absurd to require correspondence regarding new shutters for the Periyar work to pass through the Collector of Madura. Even in other districts, technical questions constantly arise, *e.g.*, G.O., No. 407 I., dated 26th September 1907, taken from a circulated perusal file which happened to come round to-day. Apart from these highly professional matters, there is the great question of distribution of water. This is the point where the contact between the Public Works Department and the Revenue Department is closest. In the large irrigation systems, such as Gódávari and Kistna, the control of distribution is almost wholly in the hands of the Public Works Department, and Mr. Cumming, I.C.S., Collector of Godávari, told the Decentralisation Commission that he did not see how this could be altered in the delta "as the system of water distribution through channels was most intricate". Experience of the Periyar system in the Madura district disposes me to agree with Mr. Cumming's view in this matter. I submit that it would not be possible to transfer to Collectors control over the distribution of water unless smaller districts are created, or relief otherwise afforded to Collectors. If so, it is not practicable to place the Executive Engineer in the position of District Forest Officer as regards the Collector in respect to irrigation, any more than in respect to buildings, and the Board's suggestion to this effect must therefore, I submit, be rejected as generally impracticable and unpractical.

Madras Times of 6th December.

7. The Board, however, also suggests (perhaps without noting the essential difference between the two proposals) that the Executive Engineer should be placed in the position of the *District Superintendent of Police* as regards the Collector. This seems a more possible plan, but it still leaves the actual limits to be imposed on the Collector's authority rather vague. It seems necessary to consider what specific powers should be given to the Collector over the Executive Engineer and in this connection Mr. Butterworth's complaints may be noticed.

8. Mr. Butterworth cites 24 cases of delay on the part of the Public Works Department. The first remark as to these cases is that we have not yet heard what answer the Executive Engineer may have to make. Experience shows that there is generally another side to such complaints, and it is most likely that the Executive Engineer would be able to show that some at least of the instances of delay and neglect were due to references to other officers, to subordinates, to ryots and so on. Thus, in the Alangudi channel bridge case, the delay is shown, even in Mr. Butterworth's memorandum, to have been due to references made by the Executive Engineer to the District Board Engineer. A second remark on Mr. Butterworth's 24 instances of delay is that Mr. Butterworth has himself said that in the Trichinopoly district insufficient money and establishment have been provided by the Public Works Department for the work to be done. In paragraph 4 of his letter, dated 7th March 1907, Mr. Butterworth wrote:—"Unless Government is prepared to supply adequate funds and "establishment, the channels will never be in proper order, whichever department "has charge of them. If the channels continue to be starved as they have been "(simply, I believe, because the local Public Works officers have failed to impress on "Government the urgent need for liberality), it is useless making proposals in "regard to a change of system. What I would strongly urge is that we must have "more money and more men." If the men and money have been insufficient in the past, it is perhaps hardly reasonable to place instances of delay wholly to the debit of the Public Works Department. Lastly, I submit that the real cause of Mr. Butterworth's instances of delay (in so far as they were not due to insufficient establishment and allotment) is to be found in the neglect of individual officers. Trichinopoly is, I believe, a light Public Works Department charge, and perhaps ineffective men

G.O., No. 2221, Revenue, dated 4th September 1907, page 16.

have gone there. If the Executive Engineer happens to be slack and inefficient, even the control of the Collector won't prevent delay. It may be added that the Collector's office seems in some cases to have neglected to follow up references to the Executive Engineer by a systematic despatch of reminders.

9. At the same time it may be admitted that greater power to co-ordinate the work of the Public Works and Revenue Departments might usefully be vested in the Collector. Without sanction of the Government of India, no change in the Public Works Code can be made, but the introduction of a few simple, practical directions would probably do a good deal to meet the case on which the Board founds its Proceedings. The first point is the amendment of the rules, which were laid down in the appendix to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, regarding the relation of Public Works officers to Collectors of districts. Rule 3 of those rules may perhaps be amended so as to read as follows :—

"3. As the Collector is the head of the district, the assistance and professional "advice of the Public Works Department are wholly at his disposal, if required; any "information he may call for should be promptly supplied, and if the Collector issues "any definite instruction to the Executive Engineer, it should [ordinarily] "be complied with [unless] ∧ the Executive Engineer considers that it is not in "the public interest to do so, when he "will ask the Collector to refer the matter "to Government through the Superintending Engineer."

[ ] omit.

∧ [ ] omit After he has complied with the requisition if.

G. S[TOKES].
17-12-07.

Then, in rule 5 of the same rules, a sentence might be inserted at the end—

"All important proposals as to changes in the *system* of distributing water "should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission to the Superintending Engineer or to Government, and the Collector should be furnished with "information as to any such changes decided upon before they are carried out."

This addition is inserted in view of the cases, which appear to have occurred in Gódávari, of important changes being made without the Collector being advised. See Mr. Cumming's evidence.*

* The *Madras Times*, 6th February.

10. The Board further suggests that Executive Engineers may be required to furnish Collectors with quarterly lists of unanswered references, the last column of which would show what steps had been taken to get the subject disposed of. This return would, I think, be useful both to Collectors and to Executive Engineers in drawing attention to pending files. It could not be in the form shown in Appendix IX-B to Board's Standing Order No. 165, but would give details for each pending paper. This proposal is approved in the Public Works Department and may be sanctioned.

11. Lastly, the Board suggests that orders should be issued in the Public Works Department ordering the maintenance of an arrear list like that prescribed in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30. This will be necessary in order to compile the quarterly lists of pending references, and the proposal may, I submit, be approved. If these few concrete steps are taken, it does not seem that further action is at present necessary to increase the Collector's control over the Public Works Department. Any further reform must come, I submit, from within.

Page 301 of Board's Standing Orders, Vol. I.

A.G.C.
6-12-07.

Since this note was written, His Excellency the Governor has drawn my attention to paragraph 26 of the Government's memorandum furnished to the Decentralisation Commission which I had not before seen The particular question of the Collector's control over distribution of water and repair of tanks will presumably be further considered in connection with the Public Works Establishment Committee. Meanwhile the above proposals will perhaps go a good way to settle the matter.

A.G.C.
6-12-07.

My note, dated 26th August 1907, at page 2 is, I submit, quite correct and furnishes no sufficient ground for the Honourable Member's reflection.

A.G.C.

Only shows practical ignorance.

G.S.F.
3-1-08.

The Revenue Secretary does not quite realize the position of the District Superintendent of Police.

G. S. F[ORBES].
2-1-08.

Though the Board's proposal seems to melt away into uncertainty under the pure white light of reason which the Revenue Secretary has turned on to it, what the Board means and intends to suggest is quite intelligible and is, in my opinion, sound.

2. A department in this country has two aspects. In one connection we may regard its internal constitution, in another its external activities. It is with the latter that we are now concerned. No one would suggest that in matters disciplinary or professional the department should be controlled from outside, but where its duties bring it into active contact with the outside public, it is absolutely necessary that a brake should be applied to the wheels of its official zeal.

3. It is in connection with the external activities of the department that Public Works Department needs to be brought under criticism and control. The department has always been a water-tight compartment of Government, which has kept its doors shut, repelling with indignation any lay criticism of its work or its ends. But the late experience in the Punjab in connection with the Colonisation Bill, the unrest in connection with which I was told the other day by a man who has been there for sometime past is due solely to the Engineer's doctrine that water should be sold for what it is worth as well as the irritation which is now being caused in Gódávari by the attempts which are being made to improve the duty of water, shows that the department must be subjected to outside criticism and control both in the Government and outside it.

4. So far as Government is concerned, for years past it has been the rule that the portfolio of the Public Works Department should be held by His Excellency the Governor for the time being. That there is much to commend this arrangement is true, but there can be no doubt that it has strengthened the naturally strong departmentalism of the department. While many of the weaknesses of the department have gone undetected and uncorrected, its inherent contempt for outside needs and opinion has flourished.

But the dual position of Public Works Department Secretaries who are not only Secretaries to Government but also executive heads of their departments also conduces to the same end. Secretaries in the other departments have no independent authority whatever and are and should be merely the mouthpieces of the Government.

G. S. F[ORBES].
2-1-08.

5. The effect of the control of the District Magistrate over the District Superintendent of Police and of the Collector over the Forest Officer is to ensure that the action of the department shall not be such as to override the rights or hurt the interests or susceptibilities of the great body of the population likely to provoke resistance or discontent. Action likely to produce such effects should obviously be under the control of the officer whose duty it is to deal with and prevent such discontent. Of all the activities of the Public Works Department there is none likely to produce such discontent as their action in distributing water. But this is the function in regard to which the department most resent criticism or control. From papers which I have seen as well as his evidence before the Decentralisation Commission, I believe it is the **A** fact that the Collector of Gódávari knows nothing about the revision of the duty of the water in the Gódávari delta, though the action of the Public Works Department is causing acute irritation there. (2)

But the Collector and the District Magistrate also supervise and may, at any time, take the immediate direction.

G. S. F[ORBES].
2-1-08.

6. In the memorandum submitted to the Decentralisation Committee we have stated that this subject, viz., the bringing of the Executive Engineer under the control of the Collector will be considered in connection with the report of the Committee on Public Works Department establishments. The Board may be told this formally.

G. S. F[ORBES].
2-1-08.

7. It is proposed to restrict the orders in the present case to three points—see page 4 of the notes.

8. The first is to insert the words "assistance and" in rule 5 of the rules in G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902. This may be done but it is not enough in my opinion. In his later note the Revenue Secretary goes much further. Supposing the District Magistrate on the spot orders a Public Works Department understrapper to open a sluice which may be necessary to prevent a riot, the Public Works Department official will refuse. They won't even obey an order of Government in any other department which has not been communicated to them through their own department officers. What is needed is that it should be laid down that the Public Works Department officers in the district should obey all orders on matters not professional issued to them by the Collector and after they have done so report to the Superintending Engineer if they think it necessary or desirable. First obey and argue afterwards is the position which must be taken up. If the Collector cannot justify his order he will suffer. I think the revised rule 3 of the rules in G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, as drafted by the Revenue Secretary, may be accepted but the last five lines of the proposed rule on page 7 of the notes should run :—

> A magisterial order he would be bound to obey. The question is as to the control of the *Collector*.
>
> G. S. F[ORBES].
> 2–1–08.

B (marginal mark: "is that it should be laid down … by the")

C

"After he has complied with the requisition if the Executive Engineer considers that the order is not in the public interest, he will refer it to the Superintending Engineer."

9. I think the addition to rule 5 proposed by the Revenue Secretary on page 7 of the notes may be approved except that the first two lines should run :—

D "All important proposals for change in the distribution of water". It is not change in the system but in the actual distribution of water which gives rise to trouble.

> I think it should be clearly understood whether it is only in matters of irrigation (which affect the land revenue) or in all civil works, that the present proposal is being discussed.
>
> G. S. F[ORBES].
> 2–1–08.

R

10. I think the proposals (2) and (3), which are referred to in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Revenue Secretary's note, may be approved.

G. S[TOKES].
17–12–07.

As this file concerns the Revenue Department and the Public Works Department, it should go now to the Public Works Department, *i.e.*, to His Excellency before it comes to me. I had noted a few marginal remarks before I noticed that it had not been to His Excellency.

G. S. F[ORBES].
2–1–08.

In reference to the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' note—

(1) I should like (in a separate file)* the Collector of Gódávari called on for a full report as to the extent of the irritation caused by the action of the Public Works Department (*vide* the passage marked **A**, paragraph 5, Honourable Member's note) and for suggestions as to how this irritation may be prevented or allayed.

* Now in Public Works Department (I).

(2) I should be glad to have the remarks of the Chief Engineers "W." and "I." on the proposals made by the Honourable Member in paragraph 8 of his note, passages marked **B** and **C** and in paragraph 8 of his note. (I refer to Mr. Clerk's note, pages 3 and 4 of the notes *.)

A. L[AWLEY].
8–1–08.

First put up in a separate file a reference to the Collector of Gódávari.

A.G.C.
9–1–08.

Under Secretary—

A draft reference is submitted in a separate file.

M.S.
10–1–08.

S S.
10–1–08.

Secretary—

D.T.C.
11–1–08.

The separate reference is to issue, and this file may now go to the Public Works Department and Public Works Department (Irrigation) for further remarks.

A.G.C.
15–1–08.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Will Chief Engineer for Irrigation please make his further remarks and return the file to me?

F.J.W.
17–1–08.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (IRRIGATION).

Since I noted on this subject on 28th November 1907 the ground of attack on the Public Works Department has been somewhat shifted, and Mr. Butterworth's complaints of delays on the part of this department have been adequately disposed of by the Revenue Secretary. I will therefore confine my attention to the grave charges brought by the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes against the department generally in paragraph 4 of his note, and especially in the last words where he remarks that "its inherent contempt for outside needs and opinion has flourished."

In support of this is quoted the evidence of the Collector of the Gódávari district that he was not consulted in the matter of water distribution and the fact that there have been petitions from ryots on the same subject during the current year.

2. With regard to Mr. Cumming's complaints attention is invited to Mr. Mackenzie's letter. [The letter referred to by him, of which he sent a copy to the Collector, is printed with Circular No. 4487, dated 17th December 1906.] The Collector was therefore kept fully informed of what was going on, and there is nothing to show that he either objected to or asked for any further information about the system of distribution in force this year. Nor does it appear that during the irrigation season when so many complaints were made, he made any suggestions whereby matters might be improved. It may be a fact, as the Honourable Member believes, that the Collector of Gódávari knows nothing about the distribution of water, but that, it is submitted, is his own fault and not that of the Public Works Department. It certainly seems a poor reason for investing him with supreme control over it. In any case his statement that he was not consulted appears to have been conclusively disproved.

> See note of Revenue Secretary, below.
> G. S[TOKES].
> 29–10–08.

> Paragraph 5 of his note at page 8 *supra*.

3. The fact is that this year in Gódávari there were in certain areas long spells of drought during the irrigation season, and whatever the system, there would have been serious complaints of shortage of water. This has already been explained by Mr. Howley when acting as Superintending Engineer in his No. 209 C., dated 20th September 1907, but unfortunately such an important circumstance as this does not impress itself upon the minds of the Honourable Member to whom the explanation was submitted. The necessity for resluicing the Gódávari and Kistna Deltas or rather the substitution of pipes for palmyra spouts is a matter about which there is

> I was perfectly aware of this at any rate when dealing with the question of appointing a committee to report on the changes in the deltas.
> G. S[TOKES].

no question. The adoption of a duty of 80 tentatively in the former district is not a revolutionary measure. In any case it is one which received the tacit assent of the Collector. That holders of lands which had previously received a practically unlimited supply of water through an unregulated spout should object to receive their supply though a suitable sized sluice is natural. It also appears that there may have been some difficulty in supplying high level lands here and there, but generally speaking the work now being done must result in a general benefit to the delta and although it is rash to prophesy I believe that the report called for from the Collector will show that the distribution this year has been as efficient as it could be, any shortcomings being due to the absence of local rain. The officers of the department in the Gódávari district at all events have been and are labouring hard to give an efficient and equitable distribution of water, and it is a little disheartening for them to be accused of "a contempt for outside needs".

> This is all very nice. The report of the committee will enable these points to be more fairly considered.
>
> G. S[tokes].

4. While writing this note a report on the duties attained during the first-crop season has been received from the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, and a copy is put up with the file.

It does not bear very directly on the point at issue, but it shows that during the month of September water much in excess of the calculated full supply of the canals was passed down them and that the duty attained for the whole delta during the month was considerably lower than that for which the system was designed.

I have, it is hoped, said enough above to show that as far as evidence goes Collectors are always consulted about changes in the system of distribution of water, and I can only attribute any statements to the contrary to the fact that the large amount of business which passed through their hands prevents their thoroughly studying and grasping the purport of the information on the subject which is supplied to them I maintain that, broadly speaking, Collectors are invariably consulted with regard to any change in system of distribution and that no evidence has been produced to the contrary.

> Fair words!
>
> G. S[tokes].
>
> I deny it. See papers about the Periyar and Mr. deChazal.
>
> G. S[tokes].

5. Similarly vague statements have been made that Public Works Department officers have refused to carry out the expressed wishes of Collectors in the matter of distribution, but as far as I know no specific instance of such refusal has been brought forward, and I believe that cases where Collectors wish to interfere in the distribution from our large systems are very rare if not non-existent. Even Mr Cumming does not propose to undertake the responsibility for distribution and although he says he could do nothing if people clamoured for water there is nothing to show that he has ever made any suggestion for its better distribution. Had he done so I feel certain his suggestions would have received the most respectful attention.

6. Matters being as they are I see no reason to modify the existing rules which are clear enough, except that I would accept the suggestion that executive Engineers should submit unanswered reference lists to Collectors as this although involving a little extra work may prove useful in preventing misunderstandings and keeping Executive Engineers up to the mark in disposing of matters which they consider unimportant The other suggestions made by Revenue Secretary at page 7 of the notes are, in my opinion, unobjectionable, but, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, unnecessary and only likely to cause irritation.

7. His Excellency has especially directed me to note on the passages marked **A B** and **C** of the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' note.

Point **A** has been dealt with in paragraph 2 above where it is shown that Mr. Cumming was kept fully informed of what was being done, and it is also pointed out that there is no evidence to show that he either asked for more information or made any suggestion for modifying the procedure adopted this year.

> See Revenue Secretary's note.
>
> G. S[tokes].

At **B** it is suggested that Public Works Deparment officers in the district should obey all orders on matters not *professional* issued to them by the Collector. It is not specifically stated on what points Collectors should be empowered to issue direct orders to the Public Works department, but they may be safely divided thus—

(1) Distribution of water from Irrigation Works.
(2) Repairs to Irrigation Works.

I submit that both these matters are highly professional and they are ones on which very few Collectors would care to take the responsibility of issuing orders. The distribution on our large systems is a difficult matter and a suitable system can only be decided on after careful study of the conditions prevailing in each area and of those in other more or less similar ones. With rising prices the value of the water to the ryot becomes greater yearly and it is more important to distribute it as equitably as possible. The Honourable Member writes as though the Public Works Department officer had some nefarious motive in attempting economical distribution. In times of scarcity which is the time when complaints arise all the water is utilized and we are striving to divide it to the best advantage. I will challenge any Collector to undertake the distribution in the Gódávari or Kistna systems when the demand is great and there is a short supply in the canals. I am emboldened to do this by reading the opinions expressed by Messrs. Weir, Morris and Brodie in their letters printed with G.O., No. 834, Revenue, dated 9th December 1899, in which the question of water distribution in our large irrigation systems is thoroughly discussed. I would especially invite attention to the first of these officers who puts the case very clearly.

That is just it. They won't issue any orders unless absolutely needed. They are responsible.
G. S[TOKES].

8. Next with regard to repair works, I have never known the expressed wishes of a Collector disregarded without due reason. The cases quoted are generally the petitions from ryots, of which the Executive Engineer also receives numbers. He selects those he considers most urgent for prior execution. Should the Collector express a wish for a particular work being put in the forefront of the programme, the Executive Engineer would do so unless there is good reason as there sometimes is to the contrary. Collectors sometimes ask for useless works such as clearing silt in channels when such clearance is not required, embanking rivers in unsuitable places, or deepening tanks, and the Public Works Department is right not to carry out such works, but the reason should be explained and for this reason I accept his proposal for an unanswered reference list.

9. Point **C**: I have above pointed out that no evidence has been adduced to show that any alteration in the existing rules are necessary, and I consider that the modification of the Revenue Secretary's proposals, as drafted by the Honourable Member, are not only unnecessary but might in a few cases, be mischievous. As a rule Collectors would not wish to take the responsibility of giving direct orders, but occasionally they would do so and might exercise their powers with disastrous results. I have heard of a Collector who, at the beginning of the irrigation season, ordered the head sluices of the Kurnool-Cuddapah Canal to be fully opened at once, with the result that the canal breached !

Exactly.
G. S[TOKES].

If the results are disastrous the Collector will be responsible.
G. S[TOKES].

The introduction of any such rule would cause irritation without serving any useful purpose.

10. With regard to the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' remark at **D**, that "all important proposals for change in the distribution of water should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks" is impracticable. He expressly states that it is the actual distribution that has to be approved by the Collector. Now when water runs short it is sometimes necessary to make important changes in distribution, *e.g.*, the crops under one distributory are more advanced than those under another and require less water. Any changes thus made have to be carried out at once and a prior reference to the Collector would defeat all efficient regulation at such time.

11. I submit that no evidence worthy of the name has been produced in favour of the present proposals. Any of the shortcomings of the Public Works Department are due to carelessness or inefficiency of individual officers, failings which occur in all departments and which would still occur whoever was permitted to issue them orders. The Public Works officers at the present time are making strenuous efforts to benefit both the State and the people. For these very efforts they are assailed by vague accusations at the hands of a member of the Government they are striving to benefit.

H.E.C.
29-1-08.

Public Works Department.

My remarks are specifically asked for by His Excellency on the proposals made by the Honourable Member in the passages marked **B** and **C** of paragraph 8 of his note and in paragraph 9 of his note. His Excellency also refers to Mr. Clerk's note in which the latter submits that compliance with a Collector's wishes by Superintending Engineers and Executive Engineers should be subject to the condition "unless there are good reasons for not doing so". Mr. Clerk also says at this place that "questions "of repair and alterations to existing irrigation works, apparently simple, often turn "out to be very complicated and that it is better that they should be well considered "than hastily carried out on wrong lines."

2. In the passage marked **B**, the Honourable Member expresses the opinion that the Public Works Department officers should obey all orders on matters *not professional* issued to them by Collectors. The responsibility for the effect of the order is to rest with the Collector.

3. In the passage marked **C**, the Honourable Member, it is understood, approves of the revised rule 3 as remodelled by himself, which would then run as follows:—

"As the Collector is the head of the district, the assistance and professional "advice of the Public Works Department are wholly at his disposal, if required; any "information he may call for should be promptly supplied; and if the Collector issues "any definite instruction to the Executive Engineer, it should be complied with. "After he has complied with the requisition, if the Executive Engineer considers "that the order is not in the public interest, he will refer it to the Superintend-"ing Engineer."

4. It will be noticed that although the Honourable Member has in the first passage declared his intention that Collector's orders are to be confined to matters which are not professional, the order as worded does not make this limitation. The Executive Engineer is to comply with *any definite instruction* of the Collector which might be applied to matters relating to the construction of a bridge or building or to the hundred and one things for the execution of which the State employs Engineers with special knowledge. That it is in the interests of the State for the administration to make full use of this special knowledge is recognised even in the order itself—the Collector is to have the "*professional advice of the* Public Works Department." But the State employs not only Executive Engineers who are often comparatively junior officers but also Superintending Engineers and Chief Engineers of maturer knowledge and judgment; and it is to the latter that the State looks for advice and guidance in professional Engineering matters. The practical effect of placing a District Collector in the position of control that this order as drafted would do, would be to cast aside the special knowledge of Superintending and Chief Engineers for which the State pays. It is all very well to say the control would only be exercised in matters which are not professional, that is, in matters which do not require this special knowledge, but who is to decide whether the matter is professional or not? Take the case of water distribution, for instance, I find that in the Government memorandum on decentralisation that this is classed with matters which are not professional. It is, of course, open to the Government to treat water distribution non-professionally in certain cases, as was done one hundred or more years ago in the old native systems of irrigation, and as is still done in the less important tanks, but a considerable portion of the efforts of

If the Collector issues an improper order he is responsible.

G. S[tokes].

(4)

Irrigation Engineers in later times have been directed to, and a large expenditure of public money has been incurred on, putting a stop to the great waste of water due to unscientific treatment. The distribution of water in all the modern irrigation projects as arranged for is largely a technical and professional matter. The anicuts, head and other sluices, regulators, channels laid to a certain bed slope and of a certain section, etc., form a complicated organism, and the management and control of the working of this organism by means of which water is distributed over a large area, requires the services of a professional Engineer for the best results just as much as the management of a campaign requires the services of a professional soldier, of a large hospital the services of a professional doctor, of the mechanism of a large factory or of a modern ship-of-war the services of a professional Mechanical Engineer.

5. In saying this, I mean that in any scientifically-worked system, it must remain the duty of a professional Engineer to devise and control the means for delivering a certain quantity of water to a certain point; there remains, however, the question as to what this quantity should be, and I think it is in regard to this that trouble has arisen. This is really an agricultural question, and an extremely difficult problem to solve definitely for small areas if economy of water be aimed at, because of the many uncertain and varying factors involved, such as, nature of crop and soil, methods of cultivation employed, time of sowing, conditions of actual rainfall and season. One cultivator may waste a quantity of water over his ploughing that another man may save, one man may be able to do with less water than another, owing to his having manured his land more freely. As under the present system the amount that the cultivator pays the State for water does not increase with the quantity supplied to him, the very natural tendency is for him to clamour for a liberal supply. He does not individually suffer in any way if he gets too much, but the whole community of cultivators suffers in this case because the amount of water available is limited, and if one man gets more than he needs, some other must get less than he might have done.

6. Taking account, then, of this tendency and of what is desirable in the interests of the whole community of cultivators, it is not safe to determine the quantity to be delivered solely on the demands made by individual cultivators. How, then, is it to be determined? Hitherto this has been done by the results of practical experience. It is found that in regard to particular irrigation works, the delivery of certain quantities of water at certain rates of discharge have, as a matter of fact, been found sufficient to bring to maturity certain areas of crop. From such data a "duty" of the water is determined on, and with reference to which the Irrigation Engineers design their works, having regard to the areas of land "commanded". All this is highly technical work, and although the agricultural question as to the quantity of water necessary for a certain area is involved, this has been one of the special functions of Irrigation Engineers in the past. It is obvious that once the works are carried out on this basis, the possibilities of the works in regard to water discharge are limited to those for which they were designed. It would be futile, for instance, for a body of cultivators or anybody representing their interests to demand a quantity of water under a particular channel if the channel is not capable of carrying the quantity demanded, or if the quantity obtainable from the source of irrigation was not sufficient to meet the demand. With regard to this point, however, there is a safeguard, and that is the restriction of the area irrigated to that which can, as a matter of experience, be effectually supplied. If, for instance, there arises a general outcry from the cultivators that the amount of water they are getting is too little, and assuming this to be true, what does it amount to? It may be only this, that the total area they are attempting to irrigate is more than there is water for. It is within my recollection that there have been cases where extensions of cultivation have been allowed without sufficient consideration on the Engineering side. I think extensions have been often made without any reference at all to an engineering opinion or to what the works were capable of.

7. I submit then with reference to this question of water distribution, that this proposed rule would be mischievous. I submit that the proper distribution of water on a modern scientifically worked irrigation system is so much a technically engineering question that it should be in the hands of an engineering body who

This loses sight of the aspect of the question external to the department.

G. S[TOKES].

have a full knowledge of its capabilities, and who feel the responsibilities of their duties. These duties must, of course, include the observance of any general instructions of policy laid down by Government, who will determine what these should be with the highest and best advice both in regard to technical and civil questions at their disposal. To place the Executive Engineer under the direct orders of a Collector in this matter is to treat the Executive Engineer as the highest engineering authority if his advice is followed, and if it is not followed, the Collector has to assume a responsibility in a technical matter without any engineering support at all. In either case the State is deprived of any engineering services on the part of its highest paid Engineers.

8. The Engineers are, I understand, accused of want of sympathy with, and want of due regard to the requirements of the cultivator; they don't give him enough water, or, in other words, the "duties" the Engineers assume are too high. But, however this may be, assuredly they give the cultivators all the water the works are designed to carry or that is available; they don't waste the water or carry it away; it is all used. If this is so, no amount of sympathetic distribution by the Collectors or by the Executive Engineers under the Collector can do any good. If a more liberal supply is given to some, a corresponding decrease must be made in the supply to others. The question is not to one then of distribution but of principles and design including the area to be irrigated. These are matters which are dealt with or should be dealt with by the sanctioning authorities, that is, by Government. If it is the case the Goveanment desires a larger amount of water to be allowed for in relation to the area of cultivation, orders can be passed to that effect to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, and enjoining that extensions of the areas of cultivation are to be governed by this consideration and to be subject to the sanction of any authorities the Government desires to name.

9. With regard to the repair of tanks and other existing irrigation works which would appear to be other branch of work in regard to which it is desired to give the Collector more control, I understand that what is felt is that it frequently comes to the notice of a Collector that a tank or irrigation work needs repair or is stated to need it, and that on his requesting an Executive Engineer to see to it, a very long time often elapses before anything is done. It is presumed that if the Collector were in a position to order the Executive Engineer to repair it, the work would be done much sooner. Of the reasons which may cause delay in these cases there is that given by Mr. Clerk that a work which is apparently quite simple often turns out to be very complicated —again the work may be in an out-of-the-way corner, and the Executive Engineer is short of staff to prepare estimates. The system under which such estimates are prepared, checked and rechecked itself causes delay. Proposals for improving Public Works Department methods are now being dealt with in connection with the establishment committee's report which, if carried out, should, to a large extent, remove the causes of delay mentioned above. Whatever actual steps are taken it is certain that considerable reforms and changes in the Public Works Department machine are about to take place and these must be dealt with by Government as a whole.

10. Merely to pass an order at this stage for such a radical change as putting Executive Engineers under the orders of Collectors would be, I submit, unfair to the Collectors themselves, cannot in itself effect what is wanted, and would complicate the reforms contemplated.

11. It seems possible that eventually when local Government displaces Government in its present form to a much larger extent than now, each district may become a complete unit with its own Engineer under the district administrative head doing many of the duties now performed by the general Public Works Department, but the time is not ripe for this yet. I therefore submit that for the present in regard to the subject of this file, nothing more should be done than to take steps to ensure that the external activities of the Public Works Department referred to by the Honourable Member are brought so far under the control of Government that it will be certain these activities have the full approval of Government. This can best be done by orders of Government to the executive heads of the department, who, if they do their duty, must see that the wishes of Government are carried out both in regard to technicalities and other matters. The fact that they are also Secretaries to Government should make it easier for them to do this than if they were not, because being in

a position to lay directly before Government the technical elements of all questions, and to know to the full the reasons for all orders of Government, there ought to be no possibility of misunderstanding or of orders being passed with insufficient appreciation of technical limitations. As to the subordinate officers of Government in regard to Public Works Department questions, the Superintending Engineers should be in closer touch with the head than they have been and be fully aware of Government wishes and policy. The Government should thus feel it possible to have the same confidence that the actions of Superintending Engineers would give loyal support to their wishes as they already feel in the action of Collectors. Every possible step should, I submit, be taken to promote a feeling between Collectors and Superintending Engineers that they are both working together to one end. On the one hand, the Superintending Engineer must feel that he is a trusted servant of Government and, on the other, the Collector must feel that he can have confidence in the Superintending Engineer's support and professional advice and assistance. With regard to Executive Engineers, although it is the case that Collectors must, in regard to comparatively small matters, turn to Executive Engineers for assistance, I submit that to benefit to the full by such assistance as engineering knowledge can afford, it is on Superintending Engineers more especially that the Collectors should depend. In regard to this, it has to be remembered that the position of Superintending Engineers is undergoing a change and the soundness of the proposition put forward must not be gauged by the Superintending Engineers of the past. Superintending Engineers are now to be specially selected officers, their pay has been increased, and there seems to be no reason why they should not be fit for the position of trust that I think they should hold in the best interests of the Government.

F.J.W.
27-7-08.

Revenue Department.

Better put this note file in print and show a proof.

A.G.C.
28-7-08.

Under Secretary—

Proof submitted.

M.G.
8-8-08.

S.S.
8-8-08.

Secretary—

F. Noyce.
10-8-08.

Mr. Clerk's remarks on page 11 cannot be dealt with until the notes on the file relating to the changes in method of distribution in the Gódávari delta are available. That file is still in the Public Works Department. Meanwhile please get a clean proof up to date.

A.G.C.
11-8-08.

Under Secretary—

Reference is solicited to the Secretary's order, dated 11th August 1908, *supra.* A clean proof of the notes is submitted. The file relating to the complaints in the Gódávari Delta has not yet been returned from the Public Works Department (Irrigation). Submitted that this may lie over pending the receipt of that file.

M.G.
21-8-08.

S.S.
21-8-08.

Yes.

F.N.
22-8-08.

The file may be sent again to Public Works Department (Irrigation), as Mr. C. A. Smith, the permanent Chief Engineer and Joint Secretary, has not seen it and wishes to have an opportunity of submitting any remarks.

A.G.C.
22-8-08.

Public Works Department (Irrigation) u.o.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(IRRIGATION BRANCH).

The proposals now under consideration for modifying the existing rules regarding the relation of Public Works officers to Collectors of districts arose out of a complaint from Mr. Butterworth, Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Board regarding alleged delays by the Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly, in disposal of certain references and Mr. Butterworth appears to think that some of these delays would have been avoided if he had had powers to give the Executive Engineer direct orders.

2. The Revenue Secretary has summed up the whole case very clearly and fairly from the points of view of both the departments concerned, but although I generally agree with his views I am not in favour of adopting, in the exact form proposed by him, the modification of rule 3 given on page 7 as even in this shape it is in my opinion unnecessary and may do harm.

3. With the further modification of the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes, I am strongly of opinion that it would be still worse. I will give my reasons later on, but meantime I will make a few remarks from my own personal knowledge of the particular instances of alleged neglect of the Public Works Department out of which the present discussion has arisen.

4. Mr. Butterworth in his letter to the Board admits that some of the delays were probably unavoidable and that he might have invoked the aid of the Superintending Engineer more freely than he did.

I have underlined the last words because I consider that this was in the cases specified and is in all similar cases the proper remedy and not the issue of any direct orders to the Executive Engineer which would, in my opinion, do harm and not good.

5. I was Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, during 1905-1906 and some of Mr. Butterworth's instances of delay came within this period and out of the 24 instances in which details are given eight of the works were personally inspected by me and orders given to the Executive Engineer and had the Collector referred to me, which to the best of my recollection he did not, I could have given him full information in the matter. Soon after joining the circle. it came to my notice in the ordinary course of business that the Executive Engineer of Trichinopoly was not disposing of his unanswered references as promptly as I considered desirable, and I enquired into the matter and did a considerable amount of inspection in consequence. The ultimate result of my action was a special report to the Chief Engineer early in 1906 which resulted in the Executive Engineer being removed from the division and reverted to Assistant Engineer.

This same individual had also been in charge for two years previously of the Northern Sub-Division of Trichinopoly and 15 of the 25 references quoted related to this sub-division, and he was, therefore, doubly responsible for the delay in their disposal.

6. From the above, it will be seen that it is admitted that the Executive Engineer had unduly delayed some of his references, but that there were special reasons for it and it is obvious that under the above circumstances no orders, that the Collector might have thought fit to issue, would have been of any use whatever as the fault lay with the individual Executive Engineer. Several of the references quoted above are still undisposed of, but that is because a considerable amount of investigation was

necessary, a good deal of which has since been carried out with the aid of special survey establishment and the final disposal is still under reference between the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and the Superintending Engineer.

7. It would appear as if the Collector's proposal to expedite the disposal of references by issuing direct orders to the Executive Engineer is based on a very mistaken idea that the members of the Public Works department establishment have so much leisure time at their disposal that they would be free on receipt of an order to dispose of a certain reference, to go at once and do it.

8. On the contrary all Executive Engineers in this Presidency have lists of unanswered references of varying length and they have to decide the order of urgency, and it may be pointed out that many of the references from Collectors relate to minor works in charge of the Revenue Department, which for that very reason are generally of less importance than many of the others pending with the Executive Engineer. In nearly all cases when the Collectors' references relate to works in charge of the Public Works department, they are the result of petitions and in most of such cases petitions have also been received by the Public Works department officers as well.

This is the case with several of Mr. Butterworth's instances.

9. The next instance of delay is that given by the Board and relates to Chingleput division, but as the papers are not available no remarks can be made. The last case is that of the Gódávari pipe question.

10. I have already given my views in the separate file containing the report of the Revenue Board and I am circulating separately some notes made by me during my recent inspection in the delta made with special reference to the complaints. As Government has ordered an enquiry I will reserve my further remarks and merely state here that there was considerable misunderstanding in the whole matter and that my approval of the Superintending Engineer's original proposals was itself based on a misunderstanding of what he intended to do. He gave the Collector the same information as to his proposals as he gave me, but the Collector does not appear to have made any attempt to obtain further information.

The Collector was not furnished with the Chief Engineer's memorandum of 17th November 1906 sanctioning the proposals.

A.G.C.
26-10-08.

11. It is possible that this was also due to the same misunderstanding as to the scope of the proposals but the Collector being on the spot was in a better position to obtain further particulars than I was and could easily have done so had he wished. Until my inspection I was not myself fully aware of the liberal interpretation of the Superintending Engineer's proposals which had been actually adopted in carrying them out, and I am inclined to doubt whether Mr. Mackenzie had made himself as fully acquainted with the previously existing conditions of water distribution especially as regards the extent to which turns existed as he should have done before putting his proposals into force.

12. Had he done so, he would probably have considered it desirable to obtain the definite views of the Collector instead of contenting himself with the tacit approval which the non-receipt of any reply from the Collector to his letter forwarding the copy of his letter to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation containing the proposals, entitled him, I submit, to take for granted.

13. That Mr. Mackenzie was fully aware of the desirability of consulting the Collector on the particular question is clear from the notes relating to Irrigation Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 24 G.D., dated 9th April 1902, where the former officer has expressed his own views as Deputy Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

14. I submit, therefore, that it is a matter for consideration whether the Collector (Mr. Cumming) might not reasonably have been expected to take steps himself on receipt of the Superintending Engineer's communication to obtain fuller information.

15. I am prepared to admit that fuller consultation with the Collector than actually took place was certainly desirable, but I submit that the failure to arrange for such a consultation is quite as much due to the failure on Mr. Cumming's part to take any notice of Superintending Engineer's letter as to any action or want of action on the part of the Public Works Department officers.

16. For the reasons given above, I submit that there is no evidence to show that any revision is required in the rules and that if followed in the spirit as well as the letter by the officers of both departments they are quite sufficient to ensure the desired result, *i.e.*, to keep the Revenue and Public Works Department officers in touch with each other and to ensure free consultation in all irrigation matters.

17. I will now deal with the proposals for amendment. The first three suggestions of the Revenue Secretary are specified in the Revenue Deputy Registrar's note at the foot of page 4 notes file, as having been already accepted in Public Works Department and as I agree with this I need only remark that as regard (3) a separate unanswered reference list relating to references from the Revenue Department is to my own knowledge maintained already in some division offices and probably in most, but they have not hitherto been regularly sent to the Collector as is now proposed. I consider the suggestion a very useful one and one which will, I believe, render such general complaints as those made by Mr. Butterworth and Mr. Dance quite unnecessary in future as the Collectors will, by means of these lists if properly prepared, be kept fully informed of the action taken or proposed to be taken on their references and they will have the opportunity of disagreeing with the Executive Engineer's proposals if they are not satisfied. If their representations to the Executive Engineer are not in their opinion satisfactorily dealt with, they can always address the Superintending Engineer which, as I have already stated, is in my opinion, the proper course for them to adopt.

18. The next proposal is to amend rule 3 and the Revenue Secretary recommends the following :—

" As the Collector is the head of the district the assistance and professional advice of the Public Works department are wholly at his disposal if required, any information he may call for should be promptly supplied " and if the Collector issues any definite instructions to the Executive Engineer it should ordinarily be complied with unless the Executive Engineer considers that it is not in the public interest to do so, when he will ask the Collector to refer the matter to Government through the Superintending Engineer.

19. In this connection, I would invite attention to the notes file of G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, from which it will be seen that the proposals, then made by the Board to amplify the rule, were negatived by the then Members of Government in accordance with the recommendation of the then Chief Engineer, Mr. de Winton.

20. I submit that these reasons still hold good and that the further addition from " and if the Collector . . . . . to the end " will not be of any practical use and it is very likely to result in (1) friction (2) appeals to the Superintending Engineer and consequent waste of everybody's time in calling for explanation and disposing of them when obtained. I submit that there is no evidence whatever to indicate that there is any tendency on the part of the Executive Engineers to disregard any reasonable requests of Collectors and whatever cases may have occurred of this nature and I believe they are very few, have been due to the action of individual officers and in such cases it is extremely unlikely that any more attention would have been paid by them to the Collector's request had it been in the shape of an order.

21. " No man can serve two masters " and the attempt to make the Executive Engineer an exception to the above rule the truth of which no one will question can only result in absolute failure.

There is no such proposal. What is proposed is that if the Collector issues an order the Executive Engineer shall carry it out and then argue.

G. S[TOKES].

22. My objections to the rule 3 as proposed by the Revenue Secretary apply with still greater force to the further amendments suggested by the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes, and I strongly recommend that rule 3 as amended by the Revenue Secretary should stop at " supplied ".

23. As regards rule 5 the Revenue Secretary proposes the following addition :—

" All important proposals as to changes in the system of distributing water should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission to the Superintending Engineer or to Government, and the Collector should be furnished with information as to any changes decided upon before they are carried out."

24. I have no objection to raise to this proposal and agree with the Revenue Secretary that it is desirable but as regards the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' proposed amendment to Revenue Secretary's rule it is impossible to protest too strongly against such a proposal.

I understand that the Honourable Member desires to give the Collector power to interfere with the actual distribution of water in cases where it is supposed to be in charge of the Executive Engineer.

25. The Revenue Secretary in paragraph 6 has given sufficient reasons from the point of view of his own department against any control over water distribution being given to Collectors in the case of systems in which the Public Works Department is responsible for water distribution; and I may add that even a Superintending Engineer would not dream of interfering with the Executive Engineer or issuing any definite orders to him as regards actual distribution except in cases of the gravest emergency.

> Neither will the Collector.
> G. S[TOKES].

26. In a delta system such as Godavari or Kistna the control of the actual water must necessarily be in the hands of the responsible man on the spot, *i.e.*, the Executive Engineer and the idea that the Collector should be allowed to issue any orders to the Executive Engineer on the subject is not to be seriously considered for one moment.

27. One or the other department must be in complete charge of actual distribution and not both, and it would be grossly unfair to expect any Executive Engineer to accept any responsibility for the irrigation works in a delta division or any large irrigation system, if any one was allowed to interfere with his personal control of the distribution.

> This is quite unsound and over-pitched and is a most improper and dangerous position to set up.

28. The Collector is, of course, at liberty to make suggestions and due consideration will, I am sure, be invariably given as far as practicable, but as long as the Executive Engineer is considered to be responsible he must have an absolutely free hand.

29. I have expressed my views in the question strongly because as the officer responsible to Government for the executive administration of the chief irrigation systems including distribution of water I feel that I myself could not undertake this responsibility if such a suggestion as that of the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes were to be carried out.

30. In conclusion I wish to say that no one is more strongly in favour than myself of the Revenue and Public Works Department being in touch with each other and more especially with regard to irrigation works. I have pursued this policy throughout my service and have made my subordinates follow it too, I have never, as an Executive officer, had any friction with the Collector or his Divisional officers and have never found any rules necessary. I am strongly of opinion that the rules with the slight amendments, upon which I have noted above, are sufficient for these purposes and any attempt to make them more definite will defeat their own object.

> You are a very notable exception. During the seven years I was Collector of Salem I never saw the Superintending Engineer and only heard of his being in the district once.
> G. S[TOKES].

C. A. SMITH.
5–9–08.

To Revenue u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Secretary—

Put very briefly the effect of the Public Works Department notes is that the department is prepared to accept the amended rules proposed by the Secretary in paragraph 9 of his note, dated 6th December 1907, on page 7 above, but that

> In part only.
> A.G.C.
> 26–10–08.

it strongly objects to the modifications proposed by the Honourable Member in his note, dated 17th December 1907, on page 9 above.

2. The Public Works Department have, I think, somewhat misunderstood the effect of the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member in rule 5. As amended it reads "All important proposals as to change in the distribution of water should be "forwarded to the Collector for remarks "before submission to the Superintending "Engineer or to Government, etc." This hardly gives the Collector power, as Mr. Smith supposes, to *interfere* with the actual distribution of water in cases where it is supposed to be in charge of the Executive Engineer. Remarks are a very different thing from orders. The Public Works Department (Irrigation) have not noted the extent of the changes in the distribution of water which can be carried out by the Executive Engineer on his own responsibility without reference to the Superintending Engineer or to Government.

Please see paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' note on page 9 of note file, from which it is clear that the Honourable Member contemplated interference by the Collector with actual distribution.

C.A.S.
3-9-09.

F.N.
8-10-08.

Honourable Member & Circ.—

Rule 3 of the rules regarding the relations of the Public Works officers to Collectors which are printed in the Appendix to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, is as follows:—

"3. The professional advice of the Public Works Department should be wholly at the Collector's service if called for, and such information as he may desire on Public Works in his district should be promptly supplied."

In my note dated 6th December 1907, I proposed to amend this as follows:—

"3. As the Collector is the head of the district, the assistance and professional advice of the Public Works Department are wholly at his disposal, if required; any information he may call for should be promptly supplied, and if the Collector issues any definite instruction to the Executive Engineer, it should ordinarily be complied with unless the Executive Engineer considers that it is not in the public interests to do so, when he will ask the Collector to refer the matter to Government through the Superintending Engineer."

The Hon'ble Mr. Stokes, in his note dated 17th December 1907, considered that Rule 3 should run as follows:—

Pages 8 and 9 *supra*.

"3. As the Collector is the head of the district, the assistance and professional advice of the Public Works Department are wholly at his disposal, if required; any information he may call for should be promptly supplied, and if the Collector issues any definite instruction to the Executive Engineer it should be complied with. If the Executive Engineer considers that the order is not in the public interest, he will, after he has complied with it, refer it to the Superintending Engineer."

Mr. Smith objects to the latter part of my draft as likely to cause friction and appeals to the Superintending Engineer, which is perhaps true, and he objects still more strongly to the Honourable Member's draft on the ground that no man can serve two masters. This maxim is, however, out of date, and I submit that the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' draft of Rule 3 may be approved.

My proposal amounts to this: "Do first and argue afterwards." If the Collector is wrong, he will suffer.

G. S[TOKES].
29-10-08.

2. Rule 5 of the rules in the Appendix to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, is as follows:—

"It is desirable that Superintending and Executive Engineers should, as much as possible, consult Collectors and Divisional Officers personally in regard to the Public Works interests and needs of the district, and all officers of the Public Works Department should co-operate cordially and readily with the Revenue officers of the district."

In my note dated 6th December 1907, I proposed to add at the end of this rule the following:—

"All important proposals as to changes in the *system* of distributing water should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission to the Superintending Engineer or to Government, and the Collector should be furnished with information as to any such cha ges decided upon before they are carried out."

The Hon'ble Mr. Stokes, in his note dated 17th December 1907, considered that this addition should begin :—

"All important proposals for change in the distribution of water" should, etc.

Mr. Smith accepts my proposal and agrees that it is desirable, but protests strongly against the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member, and states that he could not be responsible for the executive administration of the chief irrigation systems, if such a change were made. I agree with Mr. Noyce that the effect of the Honourable Member's suggestion has probably been somewhat misunderstood in the Public Works Department (Irrigation); but as the chief object is to keep the Collector advised of important changes in the *method* of distribution, and not of changes in distribution in individual instances, I submit that my draft addition to rule 5 may be approved.

3. In this connection it seems necessary to refer briefly to the controversy as to Mr. Mackenzie's action (as Superintending Engineer, I Circle) over the Godavari pipe-sluice question. The facts are as follow: In a letter to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No. 1507, dated 6th November 1906, Mr. Mackenzie submitted certain suggestions and conclusions as to the duty of water, the remodelling of channels, and the substitution of pipe-sluices for palmyra spouts in the Godavari delta. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation, in his Memorandum No. 4487, dated 17th November 1906, referred this letter to a large number of selected officers of the Public Works Department for remarks. In a separate Memorandum No. 4486 of the same date, he also informed the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, that the Superintending Engineer's proposals were approved. This memorandum was not sent for Revenue Department for acceptance nor communicated to Revenue. On the 13th December 1906 the Collector of Godavari received from the Superintending Engineer a copy of the Superintending Engineer's letter to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No. 1507, dated 6th November 1906; but he did not receive a copy of the Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 4486, dated 17th November 1906, sanctioning the Superintending Engineer's proposals, and therefore he did not know that the Superintending Engineer's proposals had been sanctioned, still less that they were being carried out. It is, therefore, I submit, absurd for Mr. H. E. Clerk to say that the Collector "was "kept fully informed of what was going on." Mr. Mackenzie's statements in his letter No. 3137-G, dated 17th December 1907, are, I submit, quite disingenuous. He says (paragraph 2) that his letter of the 6th November 1906 was "not a proposal for new rules for distribution of water", yet he admits (paragraph 3) that his letter involved changes in sluicing and that, "in fixing "pipes, even temporarily, it was of course necessary to decide the duty, since that "determined the size of the pipe". He admits too that the use of continuous flow, instead of interval turns, was involved in his proposals; yet he contends "that there "have been no new rules in the sense in which you used the term." This is, I submit, mere quibbling, and if Mr. Mackenzie's defence means anything at all, it means that all the petitions and agitation referred to in the papers recorded in G.O., No. 2401, Revenue, dated 28th August 1908, arose without any change at all being introduced by the Public Works Department in the methods of distributing water. If there was a change, and an important change, in those methods introduced by the Superintending Engineer, it was introduced, without the Collector being previously consulted on the proposals or advised that the proposals had been sanctioned and were to be carried out. The case establishes, I submit, conclusively the need for the amendment of rule 5 which is above proposed.

This language of one Secretary about another is almost strong enough for an Honourable Member about a Secretary?

G. S. F[ORBES].

4. Finally, it was proposed in my note, dated 6th December 1907, that Executive Engineers should be required to furnish Collectors with quarterly lists of unanswered references, and that they should be instructed to maintain an arrear list like that prescribed in Board's Standing Order No. 165 (30). Mr. Smith considers this proposal a useful one and accepts it. It therefore does not call for further remark.

A.G.C.
26-10-08.

40

As to Rule 3.—I am still of opinion that the Executive Engineer or Public Works Department officer should not be allowed to argue before he carries out the Collector's order. It simply means that he will not carry out the order at all but do as he pleases in spite of it. All Mr. Smith's argument about "two masters" is absurd because if the Collector gives an order, the Public Works Department officer's responsibility is at any end and the Collector will have to justify himself against the Superintending Engineer and the Government in the last resort. The Collector's interference will be limited to what is absolutely necessary.

As to Rule 5.—As to the change proposed in this rule, I consider that the wording proposed by me should be retained. If the rule is laid down as proposed by the Revenue Secretary, Mr. Mackenzie's argument shows how futile it will be. We have lately had evidence too of the changes which the Executive Engineer has been introducing in the Periyár tracts by a stroke of his pen. He introduced and abolished "turns" in a most improper way. It will be argued that pipe-sluicing and irrigation by turns are not changes in the "systems" of irrigation and the trouble at which the rules are aimed will go on unchecked. My proposal relates only to "important changes" in distribution. If the rule applies only to changes in the "system" or, as the Revenue Secretary now puts it, in the "method" of distribution, it will be a dead letter. For instance, the Executive Engineer might alter the turns of every village in the Periyár system without any body knowing anything about it. S

G. S[tokes].
29–10–08.

Returned by the Hon'ble Sir G. S. Forbes without note.

V.P.
12–7–09.

The Honourable Member—
The Hon'ble Mr. Hammick, C.S.I.—

This file has been returned by the Hon'ble Sir G. S. Forbes without any orders. I therefore circulate it afresh as the Honourable Members have not seen the papers hitherto.

L. M. Wynch.
15–7–09.

Please see paragraph 541 of the Decentralization Commission's Report, also volume II, appendix, page 328. It is there said that Government think it is important that the officers of the Public Works Department should be in subordination to Collectors in non-professional matters affecting the ryots, and that Government propose to take the matter into consideration in connection with the report of the Public Works Department Committee. Where are the notes (if any) connected with this remark?

And has the matter been referred to or taken into consideration in connection with the Public Works Department Committee's report?

J. N. A[tkinson].
1–8–09.

I cannot find that the point was ever actually referred to the Committee. At any rate they have not dealt with it.

L.M.W.
1–9–09.

This is the old story and there is not much to be gained by writing more on it. My experience as Collector was happily with an Executive Engineer—Mr. Davidson—with whom I worked with great cordiality. We camped constantly together, went over all the irrigation systems in South Arcot together and worked for two years and a half without any friction whatever

A I think Mr. Stokes went too far, and unnecessarily so, and I don't think it would be wise to make the alterations in the rule as drafted by Mr. Cardew on page 7 of the notes. I do not think the Collector should be able against the advice of his Engineer to enforce the carrying out of any measures he chooses to propose.

41

B I have no objection to the proposal made by Mr. Stokes on page 9 **D.**

As far as I can see now, if an order issues as proposed by Mr. Cardew with the amendment suggested by Sir G. Stokes on the point of the distribution of water, it is as far as we should go now.

I have not seen the report of the Committee on the Public Works Department on this point of the relation of the two departments, but I doubt whether we shall ever be able to bring the relation of the two sets of officers into better accord by any definite rules. The great points to emphasize are—

(*a*) that the Superintending Engineers and Executive Engineers should thoroughly understand that nothing of importance should be done by them without informing the Collector fully on the subject;

(*b*) that the Collector has the right to obtain without delay any information he desires as regards Public Works Department work in his district and that the Engineers should make a point of looking upon calls from the Collector as important and urgent;

(5) (*c*) that the Collector should have the power to stop any changes in the existing order of things as regards distribution of water until the matter has been referred to the Government;

This would be the best manner of safeguarding the matter.

M. H[AMMICK].

(*d*) the Collector should have the means of seeing whether his letters and references to the Public Works Department in his district are being properly attended to. The Revenue Secretary's proposals as to arrear lists will secure this.

The paragraph in the Decentralization Commission's report is not helpful and probably they would have been put to it to work out the details of any scheme to produce the effect they desire.

Mr. Meyer, I know from what he has said to me at one time, favoured the Punjab system under which the Public Works Department officers fix the rates, collect the revenue and settle the distribution of the water—a system we certainly do not want down here.

What we want to obtain is that the Collector shall know of everything that the Public Works Department is intending to do in the district that he may get his opinion considered if necessary.

M. H[AMMICK].
5-8-09.

Please draft in accordance with the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick's note and put up copy of the report of the Public Works Department Committee.

L.M.W.
6-8-09.

Under Secretary—

A draft order is submitted.

2. A copy of the report of the Public Works Establishment Committee is submitted below. It is understood that the report is under disposal in the Public Works Department.

The Committee have not dealt with the question at all in their report.

L.M.W.
28-8-09.

3. With reference to the Honourable Member's note dated 1st August 1909 (page 23 *supra*), the original of the memorandum furnished by this Government to the Decentralization Commission is submitted below. It is not traceable on which discussions the paragraph in question was based.

G.P.V.
24-8-09.

P.T.S.
24-8-09

Secretary—

A draft order embodying the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick's view is put up, as directed.

S. VENKATARAMADAS.
26-8-09.

Let me have a clean typed copy of the draft as amended by me please.

L.M.W.
28-8-09.

Assistant Secretary—

A typed copy of the draft order is submitted.

G.P.V.
30-8-09.

P.T.S.
30-8-09.

Secretary—

S.V.D.
31-8-09.

The draft may be sent to the Public Works Department (Irrigation) for acceptance or remarks before circulation to the Honourable Members.

L.M.W.
1-9-09.

To the Public Works Department (Irrigation) u.o.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(IRRIGATION BRANCH).

Secretary—

It would, it is thought, be more in keeping with the intentions of the Honourable Members if the words "system of" or "method of" were introduced before distribution of water in line 2 of the addition to rule 5.

The proposed order being a modification of a Public Works General Branch order should, it is thought, be issued in the Public Works Department. It cannot be finally accepted in this branch.

T. W. S. SMYTH.
3-9-09.

The draft order as now sent to me for acceptance contains the Hon'ble Sir G. Stokes' amendment to rule 3 against which I have recorded my opinion in paragraphs 18-23 on page 20 of this notes file, and I have nothing to add to what I have written there. I submit, however, that the order as now drafted is not in accordance with the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick's instructions for at **A** on page 24, note file, the Honourable Member distinctly states that he does not think that Mr. Cardew's proposed amendment to rule 3 as stated on page 7, note file, should be made.

This amendment is that originally proposed by Mr. Cardew and modified by the Hon'ble Sir G. Stokes with whom the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick specifically states in the same paragraph that he disagrees. From this I understand that the Honourable Member does not consider it necessary to alter rule 3.

The Honourable Member also states at **B** on page 24, note file, that if the proposed amendment to rule 5 is made "it is as far as we should go now."

I submit therefore that the portion relating to rule 3 should be omitted from the draft.

If this is done, I am prepared to withdraw my objection to the proposed amendment to rule 5 as stated in paragraphs 23-29 on pages 19 and 20, note file. These objections were based on the supposition that the Hon'ble Sir G. Stokes wished to give the Collector power to issue orders to the Executive Engineer with reference to actual distribution of water in support of which supposition, please see the Honourable Member's paragraphs 8 and 9 on page 9, note file.

(6)

If the proposed amendment to rule 3 is withdrawn, the Collector will not have this power, and in that case I have no objection to the proposed amendment to rule 5.

In order, however, to guard against unnecessary interference with the Executive Engineer's discretion in making temporary changes in water distribution in times of scarcity, I suggest that the word "permanent" be inserted before "changes" and the amendment to rule 5 would then read—

"All important proposals for permanent changes in water distribution, etc."

I have, however, to point out that the Government order issuing the present rules, *i.e.*, G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, is a Public Works Department order and the correct procedure would apparently be for the present order also to issue in the Public Works Department. In any case the order should be accepted by the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, as well as Chief Engineer for Irrigation before issue.

C.A.S.
4-9-09.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Assistant Secretary—

With reference to the objection raised by the Public Works Department (Irrigation) to the revised rule (3) in the draft order, it is respectfully submitted that the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick objected to *the alteration proposed by the Hon'ble Mr. (now Sir G.) Stokes* in rule (3) as drafted by Mr. Cardew, but not to Mr. Cardew's draft itself.

Page 24 *supra*.

Please see the portion marked **A** in the Honourable Member's note. That such was the intention of the Honourable Member is further evident from the portion marked **B** in the note wherein the Honourable Member approved of Mr. Cardew's proposal with the amendment suggested by the Hon'ble Mr. (now Sir G.) Stokes on the point of water distribution. Mr. Cardew's proposal was to revise rules (3) and (5), and the amendment suggested by the Hon'ble Mr. (now Sir G.) Stokes on the point of water distribution was in respect of rule (5). The Honourable Member's directions therefore were that rule (3) as amended by Mr. Cardew and rule (5) as amended by the Hon'ble Mr. (now Sir G.) Stokes should be adopted. This was how the office understood the Honourable Member's orders.

2. As regards the proposal to insert the word "permanent" before "changes" in the revised draft rule (5), it is submitted that the draft rule as it stands requires that only important proposals should be communicated to the Collector, and it is for consideration whether it is desirable to restrict further the cases that should go to him.

P.T.S.
9-9-09.

Secretary—

The sentence in regard to the interpretation of which there is a difference of opinion runs as follows:—

"I do not think it would be wise "to make the alterations in the rule as "drafted by Mr. Cardew."

Page 24 *supra*.

In preparing the draft order, this department understood the phrase "as drafted by Mr. Cardew" to refer to the words "the rule". The Chief Engineer now contends that that phrase qualifies the words "the alterations". I submit that the former appears to me to be the natural interpretation.

2. I may also point out, with reference to the marginally-noted remark * made by the Chief Engineer, that rule 3, as embodied in the draft order, is an exact copy of the rules as drafted by Mr. Cardew and excludes the amendments suggested by the Hon'ble Mr. (now Sir G.) Stokes.

* "The draft order now sent to me for acceptance "contains the Hon'ble Sir G. Stokes' amendment to rule 3."

3. I submit that this department may agree—

(*a*) to the insertion of the words "system of" before the words "distribution of water" in line 2 of rule 5; and

L.M.W.
13-9-09.

(*b*) to the order issuing from the Public Works Department.

4. As regards the insertion of the word "permanent" between the words "for" and "changes" in line 1 of rule 5, I submit that what was contemplated seems to me to be that the Collector should be consulted not only in regard to *permanent* but also in regard to *temporary* changes of an important character. Thus this suggestion militates, I submit, against the spirit of the order.

S.V.D.
10-9-09.

The Honourable Member—
The Hon'ble Mr. Hammick, C.S.I.—

When I passed the draft order I read the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick's instructions in the way the office interpret them, but when Mr. Smith came and discussed the matter with me I saw that they would also bear the interpretation he puts upon them.

For orders whether the revision of rule 3 should be left as it is or struck out altogether.

L.M.W.
13-9-09.

The questions which I put on page 23 above were not intended to be my final note on the file. I expected that the file would have come back to me with answers to the questions. However there has been quite sufficient writing already.

2. Whatever order is issued should issue in the Public Works Department I think.

Yes. I think so.
M. H[ammick].

3. It is for my Honourable Colleague to say exactly what he meant by his note which has been differently interpreted by the Revenue and Public Works Departments respectively. My own predilection is in favour of the Revenue Department interpretation, for I feel strongly that the amendments proposed in rule 3 are greatly needed in the interests of District administration. At the same time I quite agree that the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' proposals went too far.

I am sorry my words were open to a double meaning. The Revenue Department interpreted my meaning quite correctly. I accepted Mr. Cardew's amendment of rule 3, but did not approve of Sir G. Stokes' further amendments of Mr. Cardew's draft.
M. H[ammick].
16-9-09.

4. As to the rest of the draft I question the advantage of (*a*) on page 4, at any rate as it is worded at present. It is too vague for practical use. I think my Honourable Colleague was referring to *new departures*; and for the words "nothing of "importance should be done", perhpas might be substituted "no important innovation "or change in administration should be "undertaken". And then the proposed amendment of rule 5 would carry out this idea, only I would not confine the rule to changes in the distribution of water alone, I would say "all proposals for important "changes in the distribution of water or "in any other branch of Public Works "administration".

Yes. I agree to this.
M. H[ammick].

Yes. I agree.
M. H[ammick].

Cf. the Hon'ble Mr. Forbes' note against paragraph 9 of the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' note on page 9 above.

5. The compilation of lists of unanswered references is in my opinion of great importance. I have heard that prompt disposal of correspondence is not attended to as it should be in some Public Works offices. I remember one Executive Engineer showing me a bundle of unanswered

Yes. I agree.
M. H[ammick].

45

references that would have filled a cart, the earliest dating back nine years. On this point I think that the Public Works Department should issue explicit instructions, and insist on their being attended to.

J. N. A[tkinson].
14–9–09.

I agree with Mr. Atkinson and have amended the draft accordingly. I think it should issue as Public Works order. The action of Mr. Mackenzie in the Gódávarí showed clearly the necessity for some such order as this, and I cannot see that any Public Works officer will have anything to object to in its terms. It only emphasises what I suppose every Public Works Department officer will admit is correct, that no change of importance in Public Works Department arrangements in the district is to be made until the Collector has the opportunity of knowing and objecting.

M. H[ammick].
16–9–09.

To the Public Works Department u.o.

L.M.W.
17–9–09.

Public Works Department.

Under Secretary—

The draft order as finally amended by the Honourable Member may be taken over and issued in the Public Works Department. Its conversion into a Public Works Department order may be effected as shown in pencil on the draft.

R.P.
22–9–09.

Secretary—

There are two points in the order which might perhaps be further considered. The matter might perhaps best be dealt with by considering possible results of the orders.

Rule 3 as amended.—An Executive Engineer would have to obey any definite instruction of the Collector or alternatively to ask the Collector to refer the matter to Government for orders.

If a Collector considered that a certain reference of his required immediate disposal, he might, in accordance with this rule, instruct an Executive Engineer to proceed at once to a certain place and inspect a certain work. The Executive Engineer might have other important work on hand and consider it prejudicial to the public interest to comply with the Collector's instruction, in which case he would have to ask the Collector to refer the matter to Government.

Rule 5.—A Superintending Engineer recently introduced administrative changes into his circle which were distinctly important—involving changes in the system of passing bills, controlling expenditure, and controlling works. These came up to the Chief Engineer for approval, but in accordance with the letter of rule 5 as amended the Superintending Engineer would have had to send the proposals to the Collector for remarks—a procedure which would obviously have led to unnecessary waste of the Collector's time.

I have had no experience of the conditions which would necessitate rules of this description, so these suggested difficulties are necessarily theoretical ones; but as such rules as these are presumably intended for the benefit of officers possessing a minimum of common sense, I submit that they should be framed in a manner suited to intellects of that order.

P. Hawkins.
23–9–09.

Mr. Smith, the Acting Secretary, Public Works Department, brought this draft to me and spoke about it. He objected to rule 3 as redrafted. I have slightly amended the draft to try and make it clear that the Collector is not to think that as

46

a general rule he is to issue orders to his Executive Engineer. My Honourable Colleague has agreed to the alterations I have made. We have determined that the Collector should have the power to order the Executive Engineer in his district to take any particular course he thinks necessary. I see no reason to go back from that position.

The draft is of course a Public Works Department draft and should go to His Excellency in the Public Works Department.

M. H[AMMICK].
12-11-09.

Note for His Excellency the Governor.

This file relates to the relation of Public Works Officers to Collectors, and there has been a great deal of noting since His Excellency last saw the file on 8th January 1908.

In the hope of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion from the point of view of the Public Works Department as well as of Revenue and in order to avoid further noting, if possible, I discussed the question with the Hon'ble Mr. Atkinson just before leaving Ootacamund and with the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick since coming to Madras. My particular object was to avoid the proposed revision of rule 3; but although the Honourable Members were good enough to listen to my arguments, I much regret to find that I have failed to convince them that rule 3 as it now stands requires no revision. The latest addition of the Honourable Members makes the proposed amendment slightly less objectionable, but I most respectfully submit that it is still too indefinite and I now feel bound to set out at length my reasons for asking for further consideration. To make my case clear I am obliged to go back to the very beginning of this particular discussion as shown by the note file.

It will be seen that the question was raised by Mr. Butterworth because of delays in the disposals of references, and the Revenue Board proposed the subordination of the Executive Engineer to the Collector by making him a Personal Assistant to the Collector like the District Forest Officer and the District Superintendent of Police.

In the event of this not being approved by Government, the Board makes certain other recommendations which are quoted on page 1 of note file, and I need not repeat them here.

The Revenue Secretary, Mr. Cardew, after giving reasons against accepting the Board's first proposals, made certain suggestions on page 3, note file, which would in my opinion have met the case and were accepted in the Public Works Department. But when submitting the case to the Honourable Member in Revenue, Mr. Cardew went still further and suggested revision of rule 3 of the rules laid down in Appendix to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, regarding the relation of Public Works Officers to Collectors. The other proposed amendments to the rules as finally given in the draft order now under consideration having been agreed to by everybody, it is not necessary to discuss them further, although I think some slight verbal amendments are desirable to make them clearer. Only the proposed amendment to rule 3 need now therefore be considered.

As proposed by Mr. Cardew, it ran thus: "As the Collector is the head of the "district, the assistance and professional advice of the Public Works Department are "wholly at his disposal if required; any information he may call for should be "promptly supplied, and if the Collector issues any definite instruction to the "Executive Engineer, it should ordinarily be complied with, unless the Executive "Engineer considers that it is not in the public interests to do so, when he will ask the "Collector to refer the matter to Government through the Superintending Engineer."

Subsequently to this note, and before it went to the Honourable Member in Revenue, Mr. Cardew's attention was drawn by His Excellency to the Government Memorandum furnished to the Decentralization Commission.

The file then went to the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes, who proposed to go still further, but as the present Honourable Members have not agreed with him it is not necessary to discuss further the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' amendments. It is, however, necessary to draw attention to the Hon'ble Mr. Stokes' note, because it will be seen that he particularly alluded to the necessity for giving the Collector powers to interfere with actual water distribution. I also invite attention to paragraph 26 of the Memorandum containing

the suggestions of the Government of Madras with regard to Decentralization, which again refers specially to " questions affecting the distribution of water and the repair of tanks ". I was on furlough at the time this was sent, but I understand that this paragraph was inserted without any reference to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, or the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, who therefore had no opportunity given to them to express their views. Nor is it known what led the Government to make this recommendation. I refer to them now because I understand that the intention is that the Collector should have the powers to interfere with actual distribution of water and I must adhere in this connection to what I have expressed in my note dated 5th September 1908. The distribution of water is a very technical matter and it has been entrusted in the Deltas and elsewhere to the Public Works Department because that department has been, and I presume is still considered to be, the best agency by which to carry it out. The advisability of putting the Revenue Department in charge has been more than once discussed and negatived; and the Revenue Secretary, Mr. Cardew, in paragraph 6, page 6, note file, has shown that the Collector cannot undertake this duty.

See G.O., No. 834, Revenue, dated 9th December 1899.

The amendment to rule 3, even as now drafted, will allow the Collector to interfere with the actual water distribution, and I most respectfully protest against his being given any such power. In this connection a good deal has been written about what happened in the Gódávari in 1907–1908, but I submit that reference to the orders passed upon that report will show that this case would have been fully met by the proposed amendment to rule 5 and the amendment to rule 3 would have had no effect whatever. It is necessary now to consider what other orders might be issued by the Collectors under the authority proposed to be given to them under rule 3 as amended, and their possible effect. I have been quite unable to find out what sort of orders it is expected will be issued under this rule; and none of the Revenue Officers whom I have consulted, have been able to quote specific instances in which they have felt the want of this power. It is therefore difficult to understand what is expected to result from giving the power or what is the necessity for it. I believe the Hon'ble Mr. Atkinson considers that the power is required in case of floods; but I respectfully submit that this is, of all others, the time in which it is undesirable for a Collector to interfere with an Executive Engineer. The Executive Engineer, if worth his salt, knows all about the condition of the important irrigation works in his district and what is likely to happen when floods occur, and he receives reports from his Sub-division officers and subordinates upon which he has to use his discretion in acting, and this information is not possessed to anything like the same extent, if at all, by the Collector. The Executive Engineer knows or ought to know when his presence can do most good and if he does not, there are very few, if any, Collectors who can tell him specifically what to do or where to go in an emergency. In support of my argument that a Collector should not interfere with an Executive Engineer at times of floods, I submit the following two specific instances in which, if orders had been issued, much harm might have resulted and certainly no good could have been done :—

I mentioned this as an instance only. Of course, there may be other cases.

J. N. A[tkinson].
8-3-10.

(1) Please see G.O., No. 1222 I., dated 23rd December 1903, relating to floods in the Palar river. In this case, the Collector (Mr. Vaughan) wanted Mr. Hawkins, the Executive Engineer, to go up the Palar river to look after some villages which were flooded out and actually sent him a wire to this effect; but Mr. Hawkins knew that he was wanted more at the Palar anicut. He, fortunately, was able to meet Mr. Vaughan and in consequence Mr. Vaughan went to look after the villages and Mr. Hawkins went to his Head Works where he did valuable work and received the thanks of Government.

(2) I was Executive Engineer, South Arcot, and Mr. Wynch was Collector. Mr. Wynch and I both received reports of breaches in the Ponniar flood bank, and I had reports of floods in Chidambaram taluk where I had anicuts and important tanks, etc. As we were both at Cuddalore, I went

See reports on Ponniar floods about 1900.
G.O., No. 38 I., dated 6th January 1899.

and consulted Mr. Wynch and the result was that he went to the Ponniar breach and I to Chidambaram and when I had done what was necessary there, I went to the Ponniar breach. Mr. Wynch himself told me that if the order as now drafted had been in force, he would probably have sent me an order to go to the Ponniar. In all probability, the result would have been the same, as we should have consulted, but the order would have been a dead letter. I repeat, therefore, that in case of floods, it is far safer to leave the responsibility with the Executive Engineer as it is at present.

Again the proposed draft order entirely eliminates the Superintending Engineer, who is the Executive Engineer's professional superior officer and who also has to issue instructions to him. In time of floods the Superintending Engineer also receives reports and it may happen that he knows the division as well or better than the Executive Engineer. In such a case, the Superintending Engineer might well send instructions to the Executive Engineer, and if the Collector also did so, the question at once arises whose orders is the Executive Engineer to carry out.

I respectfully submit, therefore, that orders to Executive Engineers should not be issued by Collectors in case of floods. In such an emergency, if the Collector wanted the Executive Engineer at any particular place, it would be open to him to request him to go there if possible and the Executive Engineer would no doubt do so if he did not consider that his presence was more urgently needed elsewhere, but the responsibility of deciding this would lie with the Executive Engineer and this is right.

I would even go further and apply the principles just enunciated with regard to times of flood to all times as I consider that it is very inadvisable that Collectors should have the power at any time to interfere with an Executive Engineer's *movements*. The Executive Engineer at all times has works going on on irrigation works to be maintained all over his division. He is in touch with all of them by means of regular reports received from his Sub-divisional officers and subordinates. He gets daily water registers in delta system and for important irrigation works, and he has to be in readiness to pass orders or go anywhere at short notice as necessity arises.

A Superintending Engineer does not, as a rule, interfere with his Executive Engineer's *movements* and only in rare cases would he give him a definite order to go to any particular place at short notice because he knows that the Executive Engineer is the best person to judge where he ought to be at any particular time. I am of course referring to an average Executive Engineer in whom the Superintending Engineer has confidence. In other cases, the Superintending Engineer would usually either go to the district himself or issue instructions to the Executive Engineer if he was in a position to do so.

I do not know whether the Honourable Members intend it or not, but there is apparently nothing under the revised rule 3 to prevent a Collector from ordering the Executive Engineer to go immediately and inspect a particular tank or other work which order would very possibly be based upon a report from one of the Collector's subordinates. The Executive Engineer might and probably would want to be doing something else; but he might find it difficult to say that it would not be to the interests of Government to obey the Collector's orders and under the revised rules the whole *onus* of deciding this will lie upon the Executive Engineer, which is, I respectfully submit, not fair to that officer.

That orders of this kind are very likely to be issued is clear not only from Mr. Butterworth's original letter but also from the evidence given before the Decentralization Commission, in which attention is invited to the following:—

The Hon'ble Mr. Bradley, on page 35, Nos. 1103 and 1104, would have apparently liked to be able to order a certain tank to be repaired whether the Public Works Department wished it or not. But I submit that there are various points to be considered in such cases and there may be and usually are good reasons if a tank is not taken up for repair when the Collector has asked for it to be done.

From No. 1108 it is inferred that Mr. Bradley would issue orders relating to actual distribution of water.

From Mr. C. T. H. Johnson's evidence on page 92, Nos. 3178 to 3182, it is inferred that if the present draft is passed, he would order certain work to be carried out at once and would interfere directly with water distribution.

49

From page 99, No. 3400, the same inference is drawn.

On page 126, Nos. 4280 and 4284, Mr. Gillman would like to interfere with water distribution.

As regards the case in Madura referred to by Mr. Gillman, the Executive Engineer's action which was a radical change in system of distribution was not supported by his superior officers and the case would have been fully met by the proposed revision of rule 5.

I also invite attention to No. 4285 where it is stated that the Collector would be guided by the reports of his Revenue Inspectors and Tahsildars and would apparently interfere with the Executive Engineer on the strength of such reports.

On page 130, No. 4466, Mr. Gillman would interfere with the Executive Engineer in the distribution of irrigation. I invite attention to Mr. Wilson's remarks on page 212, Nos. 6947 and 6948 and 6995 to 7001 and Mr. Clerk's on page 260, Nos. 8268 to 8271 and 8346. The former specially alludes to the administrative chain of responsibility in the Public Works Department, which is, I submit, peculiar to that Department and which necessarily differentiates it from all other departments.

Police have much the same.
M. H[AMMICK].

Please see on page 290 Mr. J. A. Cumming's No. 8987 in which he states "yes, he (the Executive Engineer) is not definitely named my Assistant in the same way the others are", also No. 8992 which I repeat: "But suppose he had kept you better "informed or even if he had not informed you at all you would not have had the "technical knowledge which would have enabled you to distribute the water?

"No. I certainly could not have distributed the water."

From this I conclude that rule 3 revised would not have helped Mr. Cumming.

Please see also Nos. 9258 to 9262, 9333 and 9334.

I would also invite attention to the fact that although a considerable number of Revenue Officers of all grades were allowed to give evidence as to the advisability of putting Executive Engineers under Collectors, not one Executive Engineer was asked to give his views and only one Superintending Engineer. I respectfully submit that there are many senior Executive Engineers who could have given useful and reliable evidence on such a subject.

In conclusion, I most respectfully submit that sufficient weight has not been given to the opinions of Public Works Department officers in this important question. I wish to say most emphatically that I am not objecting to the proposed revision of rule 3 for any sentimental reason but because I am firmly convinced that the proposed revision is not administratively sound, that it cannot possibly do any good and is likely to do harm. I respectfully suggest that before passing final orders on the draft, the question may be discussed in Council and that both Mr. Wilson and myself may be allowed to be present at the discussion.

C.A.S.
4-12-09.

His Excellency the Governor—

This file was handed over to me by Mr. Smith with the foregoing note addressed to His Excellency. His Excellency spoke to me about it last week and I had determined to take it to His Excellency to-day. Yesterday evening I received a request from Revenue to forward the file for reference as Honourable Members had called for it. As His Excellency has not yet seen the note referred to, I submit the papers before complying with the requisition from Revenue.

F.J.W.
18-2-10.

The Hon'ble Mr. M. Hammick, C.S.I., C.I.E.—

The Hon'ble Mr. J. N. Atkinson, C.S.I.—

I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by my adding to these very voluminous notes.

I should be glad if my Honourable Colleagues would read Mr. Smith's note to myself which has been added to the file. The request that before final orders are passed a

50

discussion of the question in Council, at which both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Smith may be present, may be held seems to me to be reasonable enough.

Will my Honourable Colleagues consent to such a course?

A. L[AWLEY].
6-3-10.

I have no objection whatever to discussing this matter in Council.

M. H[AMMICK].
7-3-10.

I gladly accept His Excellency's proposal.

J. N. A[TKINSON].
9-3-10.

These papers will be taken up to the next Council.

F.J.W.
14-3-10.

As directed by His Excellency this afternoon, I submit these papers to His Excellency for perusal prior to discussion in Council.

F.J.W.
2-6-10.

N.B.—In the linked file below there is a reference on the same subject marked for Council.

F.J.W.
2-6-10.

Demi-official from A. Y. G. CAMPBELL, Esq., I.C.S., Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor, to the Hon'ble Mr. F. J. WILSON, C.I.E., dated the 6th June 1910.

I am desired by His Excellency to have these current files and notes printed and to send *one* copy in print to His Excellency and each Honourable Member before the case comes up for discussion in Council.

Registrar—

See instructions in Private Secretary's letter. The notes and current files should be printed and copies sent to Honourable Members as desired.

F.J.W.
6-6-10.

Copy submitted to His Excellency the Governor.

G. D. PLUMMER.
9-6-10.
F.J.W.
10-6-10.

Chief Engineer—

I append herewith alternative draft amendments to the rules.

Please let me have your remarks thereon after consultation with the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and at the same time send a copy both of my draft amendments and your observations to Honourable Members.

A. L[AWLEY].
23-6-10.

* * * * *

ALTERNATIVE DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES.

For Rule 3, *substitute*:—

As the Collector is the head of the district, the assistance and professional advice of the Public Works Department

S/

are wholly at his disposal if required; any information which he may call for shall be promptly supplied; if the Collector, for any special reason, sends any other definite request to the Executive Engineer, it should ordinarily be complied with; but if the Executive Engineer considers that it is not in the public interests that he should comply with the request, he will without delay discuss the matter personally with the Collector or report his reasons in writing to the Collector who will address the Superintending Engineer or the Board of Revenue if he wishes to press it.

Add to Rule 4 :—

All proposals for important changes in the distribution of water or in any other branch of Public Works administration shall be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission to the Superintending Engineer. The remarks of the Collector shall be forwarded to Government or other sanctioning authority, and a copy of the final letter or endorsement of the Executive Engineer and the Superintending Engineer shall be sent to the Collector at the time of despatch. A copy of the final orders passed shall be sent to the Collector before they are carried out.

(1)

Add to Rule 5 :—

This is particularly important in times of emergency such as famine and flood; at such times the Public Works Department officers should, as far as possible, keep the Collector and Divisional Officers informed of their movements and of the measures they are taking for dealing with the emergency.

A. L[AWLEY].
23–6–10.

Will the Chief Engineer for Irrigation please add any remarks he has to make?

F.J.W.
27–6–10.

The amendments as now proposed by His Excellency are free from the objections raised by me against those previously proposed and should, I consider, be quite sufficient.

C.A.S.
27–6–10.

His Excellency the Governor—

The alternative draft amendments of the rules prepared by His Excellency meet the objections raised in the Public Works Department to the former draft, and copies have been circulated to Honourable Members as directed.

* * * * *

F.J.W.
27–6–10.

* * * * *

I would like these notes printed up sharp please and the file circulated again to Honourable Members.

I cannot help hoping that the amendments which I have now proposed may commend themselves to my Honourable Colleagues.

In that case there need be no further delay in the issue of orders.

* * * * *

A. L[awley].
1–7–10.

Registrar—

See His Excellency's note dated 1st July 1910 and act accordingly.

F.J.W.
2–7–10.

Public Works Department.

Circulated to the Honourable Members as directed by His Excellency the Governor in his note dated 1st July 1910.

S.S.A.
9–7–10.

P.H.
9–7–10.

To the Hon'ble Maharaja Sri Rao Sir V. S. Ranga Rao Bahadur, K.C.I.E.
" " Mr. J. N. Atkinson, C.S.I.
" " Mr. M. Hammick, C.S.I., C.I.E.

I accept the amendments proposed by His Excellency.

V. S. R[anga Rao].
10–7–10.

In considering whether any, and if so what, changes are required in the existing rules, we must in my opinion distinguish between—

(i) Ordinary administration;
(ii) Special emergencies.

In regard to the former the principal complaints made by Collectors are—

(*a*) that they are left in ignorance of what has previously in these notes been called "the external activities" of the Public Works Department;

(*b*) that when they ask for any particular work to be carried out, or action to be taken, only too frequently neither is the work executed or action taken, nor is there any reply to the request.

2. So far as a rule can make provision the first complaint will be met by the proposed addition to rule 4, but only if obedience to the rule is insisted on and disregard of it receives adequate notice. I enter this last *caveat* because in this Presidency the remark of the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces that the Department is "extremely prone to uphold "the cause of a peccant subordinate" is as true as in the Central Provinces.

Paragraph 15 of the Chief Commissioner's note on page 135 of Volume VI of the Report of the Royal Commission on Decentralization.

3. His Excellency's draft addition to rule 4 seems to me acceptable, except that I would add to it a provision to prevent allotment or re-appropriation of funds regarding which the Collector has not been consulted. In this connection I would draw attention to the remarks of the Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces, in paragraph 15 of his minute above quoted. The addition might come in after the word "administration" as follows: "or for allotment "or re-appropriation of funds [regarding] "which the Collector has not previously "[been consulted."]

"to."
M. H[ammick].
"assented."
M. H[ammick].

4. As to the second head of complaint (*b*) in paragraph 1 above, what is wanted is that Collectors should be certain of getting a reply to their communications within reasonable time. This is, I think, the most common complaint that Revenue officers

have against Public Works Department officers. Requests for some piece of work to be done and reminder after reminder elicit neither action nor reply. I understand that the suggestion that officers of the department should send in lists of unanswered references is under His Excellency's consideration. At my request Mr. Wilson sent me samples of the forms of unanswered references that are now being sent in to Government, but they only cover references to and from Government, and what is wanted is a check over delays in conducting correspondence with officers of other departments, for it is not only the Revenue Department that complains.

5. There remains the case of special emergencies which has scarcely been discussed at all in the previous notes, nor even referred to till I instanced the occasion of a dangerous flood as one when the Collector should have supreme authority in his district. Mr. C. A. Smith in reply has mentioned two incidents in North Arcot and South Arcot respectively with the object of proving that in floods it is safer to leave responsibility to the Executive Engineer. His instances prove nothing. In each case the Collector and Engineer met and consulted, and the plan of action adopted would—as Mr. Smith admits in the second case—in all probability have been the same, even if the Collector had had authority to issue orders to the Executive Engineer.

6. I will quote an instance against Mr. Smith, an incident that happened in the Kistna floods of 1896, when I was personally informed by an Executive Engineer, L. D. Venkatarama Aiyar, of a very large breach in the river bank within a quarter of a mile of his house-boat, the discharge through the breach, as he said, threatening at any moment to sweep away a Pariah hamlet with a thousand or more inhabitants. He had been on the spot for over 24 hours but had done nothing to save the people except lending his dingey capable of holding six or seven persons all told to the karnam, who I subsequently found was using the boat to salve the contents of his granary. Besides a lot of Public Works Department iron punts, there was a large canoe occupied by the Executive Engineer's subordinate and capable of carrying 50 or 60 people just by in the river: and with this we got all the Pariahs into safety by 10 o'clock the following morning. But the Executive Engineer had literally made no effort of any kind to save the people, and had I not been there, they would have been left to their fate. I could issue no orders to him, and he would not accept any suggestion from me, not even to go and attend to the flood bank a mile or two above which was leaking dangerously and within an inch or two of being overtopped, but hid himself in abject terror in his boat. I reported the Executive Engineer to the Superintending Engineer who, however, "prone to uphold the cause of a peccant subordinate", after vainly trying for two months as he himself told me to get a satisfactory explanation from the Executive Engineer, recorded the papers! Had I then been empowered to issue orders to the Executive Engineer, I would have sent him off to save the Pariahs. As it was I had to stay and do it myself, as well as to arrange for strengthening the flood bank, though my presence was urgently wanted elsewhere.

7. Grave and sudden catastrophes by famine, fire and flood cannot be met by divided counsels or responsibility. The fact has been fully recognised in the case of famine, and the need for one directing head invested with authority to issue orders at a moment's notice becomes all the more imperative the more sudden the emergency. His Excellency's re-draft of rule 3 does not take sufficient account of such crises. In L. D. Venkatarama Aiyar's case, had the proposed rule 3 been in force, he would have demanded a personal discussion with me or would have written me a long report explaining why it was not advisable for him to venture his valuable life in saving others, and I should have had to pass the report on to the Superintending Engineer at Bezwada, with which place communication might at any moment have been cut off, or to the Board at Madras. Of course, I should have done what I did, left the Executive Engineer huddled in his house-boat, and gone and brought the people off myself. But it is a sorry state of affairs when a Collector cannot in an emergency count on the services of every Government official in his district.

8. It may be said that my experience with L. D. Venkatarama Aiyar was exceptional. I hope there are no other Public Works Department men who would have shown such abject cowardice and inhumanity, but there are many who, if the need for action were less patent to their own eyes, would demur to complying with a Collector's

request. It is an unfortunate fact that there are Public Works Department officers whose jealousy and dislike of Indian Civil Service men is so great that they delight in thwarting the Collector and his subordinates.

9. His Excellency has changed the word "instruction" which the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick and myself had put into rule 3 into "request". I will raise no objection to this provided the case of grave and sudden emergencies is distinguished. His Excellency has recognised the need for special provision to meet emergencies in the addition which he has proposed to rule 5. But in my opinion the addition does not g nearly far enough. His Excellency mentions "famine", but the Famine Code mak ample provision for that, and should be taken as the model for whatever orders may be issued in regard to other emergencies. This Code, of which the draft was prepared by a Public Works Department and an Indian Civil Service officer working in collaboration, and which has been approved by the Madras and the Imperial Governments, leaves no possible room for doubt that in all, save purely professional matters, connected with famine the Collector is within his district, and subject only to the control of the Board of Revenue and the Famine Commissioner and Government, supreme and authorised to issue requisitions, instructions and orders to Public Works Department officers. I may refer to the last sentence of the first paragraph of section 12 of the Famine Code, to sections 13, 20, 49, 62 (*a*) and (*d*), 64 and especially 65, an extract from which last, as most pertinent, for convenience of reference I quote here:

Cf. also paragraphs 68 and 69 of the Report of the Indian Famine Commission of 1901.

Section 65.—Executive Engineer.—

"(*a*) The Executive Engineer shall be the Collector's assistant and professional "adviser and shall be responsible for the proper conduct of all departmental relief "operations by his subordinates in accordance with the rules of this Code and the "Public Works Code and such supplementary orders as may be issued from time to "time by the Local Government or other constituted authority.

"(*b*) In all matters which are not exclusively professional, that is, which are not "connected with the methods of execution of work, he shall be subject to the control of "the Collector. In purely professional matters he shall be subject to the general super- "vision ordinarily exercised by his superior officers in the Public Works Department. "He shall be responsible for all arrangements and for the maintenance of discipline on "the works under his control. If he sees any shortcomings or any reason for alarm, he "shall promptly report them to the Collector, even though they may not lie within his "special sphere."

* * * * *

10. In face of these explicit provisions of the Famine Code it is clear that the words "famine and" must be omitted from His Excellency's draft addition to rule 5. But I go further and consider that the provisions of the Famine Code should be taken as the model for other grave or sudden emergencies. Unity of control and responsibility and the power to issue immediate orders are much more necessary in the case of sudden and violent calamities such as floods, fires and cyclones than in the comparatively slow onset and progress of famine.

11. I would therefore propose an additional rule modelled on section 62 (*d*) of the Famine Code as follows:—

"In the case of famine the relations of Public Works Department officers to "Collectors are laid down in the Famine Code. In other grave or sudden emergencies, "such as riots and civil commotions, floods, fires or storms, when life or property is "seriously endangered, all officers of the Public Works Department within the limits "of the district shall obey the Collector's orders on all points not exclusively "professional."

12. I hope that the amendments in the rules now proposed will have the desired effect of securing the cordial and ready assistance and co-operation of Public Works Department officers in District Administration: but if once more the rules are found ineffective, the only thing to be done will be to give practical effect to the declaration with which proposed rule 3 opens that "the Collector is the head of the district" and

85

that therefore he must be given powers, such as he now possesses in times of famine, to issue orders to Public Works Department officers in all except purely professional matters.

J. N. A[TKINSON].
23-7-10.

P.S.—I have got this case back from circulation in order to draw attention to a case now in circulation (C. No. 627 of 1909 in the office of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, and subsequent papers) which aptly illustrates Public Works Department methods of disposing of business, and the serious inconvenience to which our administration will always be exposed, unless these methods are radically changed.

J. N. A[TKINSON].
27-7-10.

I do not like my Honourable Colleague's amendment because it implies that outside floods, fire, famine and storms and other grave emergencies, the Collector's orders and wishes may be attended to or not as the Engineer wishes. The result I am afraid will be that in ordinary matters the officers in the Public Works Department will even further accentuate the position of independence which they now take up.

2. I suppose every Collector could tell us of cases where they have vainly time after time asked the Public Works Department officer in their district to do work and have been met, not by a refusal, but by passive resistance. I believe in almost every district this is the case. The attitude and discipline of the Department is well evidenced by the papers my Honourable Colleague refers to where the Chief Engineer for Irrigation actually excuses himself and the Government for calling upon a Superintending Engineer for an explanation! Instead of doing this, in my opinion, he should have at once called upon Mr. S. B. Murray for an immediate withdrawal of his impertinent remark.

3. I have not the slightest fear that the Collector, even if given the fullest powers over the Public Works Department, will, except in the rarest cases (when he can be hauled over the coals), unduly interfere with the Public Works Department.

4. All this jealousy on the part of the Public Works Department of the authority of other departments and all the fault-finding with the ways of the Public Works Department would vanish if it was made clear that the Collector had the right to order the Executive Engineer in his district to obey his orders, if he desired at any time to assert this position.

5. I do not like either His Excellency's proposal nor do I altogether like my Honourable Colleague's amendment.

6. I much prefer the orders as originally approved. I have no objection to add to the order some words to shew that the Collector is not expected to interfere with the Public Works Department officers in his district in what are exclusively professional matters. I should like to see the position defined in somewhat the same way as is that of the Superintendent of Police, viz., that the Executive Engineer in every district should maintain intimate official relation with the Revenue officers of all ranks, and keep the Collector specially informed of all matters relating to the well-being of the district from an Engineering aspect, that the Executive Engineer is the Collector's Assistant for Engineering purposes, and that, while the Collector should not interfere ordinarily with the Assistant Engineer in any clearly professional matter, the assistance and professional advice, etc., etc., as in the order drafted.

7. I object to replacing the word "instruction" by "request", and I do not think if His Excellency's draft is approved the relation of the Departments will be a bit improved on what they are now. I would sooner see the existing rule 3 stand as it is.

M. H[AMMICK].
4-8-10.

H.E. the Governor—

F.J.W.
5-8-10.

Please have these notes printed up and a copy sent to each Member and the Chief Secretary so that we can discuss the proposed amendments to the rules (in the draft order) in Council.

A. L[AWLEY].
8-8-10.

Order in Council of 12th August 1910.

Have the draft order recopied as amended in Council.

F.J.W.
12-8-10.

Secretary—

A typed revised draft order is put up below.

G.D.P.
13-8-10.

The accompanying draft embodies the decision of the Council of the 12th instant in regard to this particular file. My position requires me to bow to this decision of Government, but as it has been come to against the advice of the regularly constituted advisers of Government in engineering matters, and as it is part of my duty to put clearly before Government, accompanied by my own remarks, all subjects reserved for their decision, I beg to be permitted to place the following remarks on paper lest those made by me at the Council of the 12th should have been insufficiently clear or misunderstood.

2. I am not in favour of this rule No. 3, as now drafted, because it seems to me an incomplete and altogether inadequate disposal of a somewhat important change. The organization of the Public Works Department and the conduct of its officers are governed by the regulations of the Public Works Code of the Government of India. By these regulations the immediate control over the proceedings of Executive Engineers is vested in Superintending Engineers, but the proceedings of Superintending Engineers may be reviewed, whenever necessary, by the Chief Engineer who is responsible for so exercising his functions as to ensure that these officers perform their duties in a thorough and satisfactory manner. The Superintending Engineer is to control all the details of business arising in his Circle, and is responsible for the efficiency of the executive system throughout the several divisions of his Circle. The Superintending Engineer is empowered to take summary measures for the correction of any faults of system or practice which may come to his knowledge. The Superintending Engineer may fix the head-quarters of Executive Engineers and the residence of Assistant Engineers at the places he thinks best, and may transfer and post Assistant Engineers.

3. The Superintending Engineer is the officer who receives the Executive Engineers' reports, and is the officer of control in the matter of travelling allowance of those serving under him. The Public Works Code, in short, makes the Superintending Engineer of a Circle the supreme officer of control in regard to Public Works matters subject to the higher control of the Chief Engineer and of Government.

4. With regard to the duties of an Executive Engineer towards other departments, all that the Code says is that he will consider himself to be *ex-officio* the professional adviser of all departments of the administration within the limits of his charge. The Madras Government have, however, already in the rules published in G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, supplemented the Code rules with the view of securing effective co-operation between Collectors and Public Works officers, and what is there laid down would seem to meet to the full what is now recommended by the Decentralization Commission. Some additional instructions, stating amongst other things that the Collector is the administrative head of his district, have already been accepted by the Public Works Secretaries.

5. The rule 3 as now drafted goes much further, and it does not seem possible to reconcile its provisions with the Code organization of the Department on any sound basis.

57

6. This rule seems to be based upon an assumption that the Public Works Department consists essentially of Executive Engineers in charge of districts in regard to engineering matters, the local co-ordinating authority on the administrative side being the Collector. It takes no account of Superintending Engineers. The Code organization, on the other hand, probably assumes that the local co-ordinating authority on the administrative side is a Divisional Commissioner administering an area co-terminous with that looked after on the engineering side by a Superintending Engineer. However that may be, under the Code organization, the Superintending Engineer is the guiding and controlling head of the Executive Engineers, and it seems essential to efficiency and discipline that whatever positive orders are given to Executive Engineers, and no matter from what administrative authority they come, they should come through the Superintending Engineer. It is a distinct provision of the Code that in all professional matters Executive Engineers will receive their orders from, and make their reports to, the Superintending Engineer of their Circle. With regard to the Superintending Engineer's relation to the administrative authority, I am in general agreement with the recommendations of the Decentralization Commission, paragraphs 488—490, and especially with the concluding passage to the effect that for harmonious working we must trust to common sense, tact, and loyal co-operation as between the different servants of Government.

7. If alternatively the Government deems it necessary that the Collector of a district as its administrative head and local co-ordinating authority should be able to deal directly with an engineer officer whose duties are confined to his district, then, I submit, it would be necessary to consider a reorganization of the Public Works Department on different lines to that at present in force. In the first place, it would be necessary that the charges of such engineers should be co-terminous with the Collectors' charges which is not the case at present. Such District Engineers on whom the Collector would have to lean for professional advice would have to be of higher standing than the present Executive Engineers on the whole, and if there were to be Superintending Engineers over these, their duties and responsibilities would have to be entirely changed. All the proposals and efforts of the last few years to make better use of Superintending Engineers would have to be modified. I doubt very much whether any reorganization on such lines is at present practicable or desirable.

8. The new rule by itself in any case would be quite insufficient to effect an essential change of this kind. It is very indefinite, but under its provisions as worked an Executive Engineer could receive positive orders from a Collector regarding his movements, or on any subject even professional, which is contrary to the Code and other weighty opinions. It seriously interferes with the control and authority of a Superintending Engineer over his Executive Engineers, and as Executive Engineers' charges and those of Collectors are not co-terminous, there are cases where under this rule an Executive Engineer might find himself in the position of receiving positive orders from two Collectors and a Superintending Engineer. Such a division of responsibility and control seems to me to be impracticable. It is not clear to what extent it is intended Collectors should make use of this rule in water distribution questions, especially in regard to the large irrigation systems. The provision of the rule that, if an Executive Engineer considers a definite instruction of the Collector is not in public interests, he may ask the Collector to refer the matter to Government and who in that case is required to do so, does not seem to me to help matters but rather the reverse. It seems to force on both the officers an attitude which is quite undesirable and to pave the way for friction and trouble. The Public Works Code, moreover, already contains regulations as to the treatment of orders, which are somewhat different.

9. I submit that if Executive Engineers are to be made subordinate to Collectors, considerable measures of reorganization of the department are involved which require the sanction of the Government of India. Without this, there will be inconsistencies and misunderstandings which would cause great confusion. A reference to the Government of India is in any case necessary having regard to the linked file, the disposal of which was to depend on the decision on this file.

58

10. The subject of the linked file is a letter from the Government of India asking for the views of this Government on the recommendations of the Decentralization Commission in Chapter XIII of their report which is being dealt with by Revenue, but has been referred to the Public Works Department for remarks on the proposals of the Decentralization Commission in paragraphs 536 to 539 and 541 to 545 of their report. In this letter, after it is explained that the Government of India have no desire to fetter the discretion of the Governor in Council in disposing of certain matters, the following passage occurs :—

"On the more important administrative questions, however, such as the position "of the Collector in regard to public works including irrigation or forest adminis- "tration and his relation to the special departments, they desire to have an opportunity "of considering the views of the Government of Madras before any substantial change "of system is made."

11. In the following paragraph the Government of India invite the attention of this Government to the reply given by Mr. Jacob in answer to question No. 44489 in Volume X of the Minutes of Evidence.

12. I submit therefore that, before effect is given to the decision of the Council of the 12th instant by the issue of a Local Government Order, the Government of India should be addressed in reply to the letter of the linked file, which was also before the Council of the 12th.

13. The particular paragraphs of the Decentralization Commission's report on which the remarks of the Public Works Department were asked have been dealt with on pages 45–46 of the notes of the linked file which, with the notes of this file, will probably furnish Revenue with sufficient material on which to draft a reply to the Government of India except perhaps in regard to the question of water distribution. It is not quite clear what are the intentions of Government in this matter. I have given my views on this subject in my note on pages 13–16 of the notes.

14. I submit the papers to the Joint Secretary for Irrigation for remarks prior to submission to Revenue for further disposal.

F.J.W.
31–8–10.

To Revenue through P.W.D. (Irrigation) u.o.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(IRRIGATION BRANCH).

I have stated my objections to the proposed revision of Rule 3 at some length on pages 29–33, note file, and I wish to state that these objections apply equally to the latest draft order and I respectfully submit that my arguments have not been shown to be incorrect.

2. I now submit for consideration two more reasons against the proposed revision of Rule 3 which have come to my knowledge since the Council meeting:—

(I) In his paragraph 3 on page 8, note file, the Hon'ble Sir G. Stokes refers to unrest in the Punjab which the Honourable Member was told was due to the Public Works Department. I reproduce here a cutting from the *Madras Mail* which, I believe, represents the final disposal of the above matter:

"*Simla, 25th August.* The Committee of Canal and Revenue Officers recently "appointed to consider certain questions in connection with assessment in Punjab "Canal Colonies has submitted a unanimous report. It recommends that assessments "should continue to be made by the Irrigation Department. The Canal Officers, "however, are to recognise the responsibility of the Deputy Commissioners in all "matters likely to affect the welfare of the people, and to keep them informed of any "contemplated changes and other matters of importance, and the Deputy Commis- "sioners are to bring to the notice of Canal Officers any genuine local grievance that "may come before them.

"The Committee recommends the gradual abolition in all but exceptional cases "of the *Kharaba* system, by which the amount of assessment varies with the nature of "the crop on each holding and the introduction of a lower schedule of occupiers' rates. "Recommendations relating to internal and disciplinary matters are also made with a "view to reducing friction, especially in connection with the powers of officers to "grant remissions and regarding appeals against penalties for waste of water and "unauthorised irrigation."

There are several points in this which I respectfully submit for the consideration of the Madras Government:—

(*a*) That a Committee was appointed of Canal and Revenue Officers and that this Committee submitted a *unanimous report*.

(*b*) That although the powers of the Public Works Department, for good or evil, are evidently far greater in the Punjab than in Madras, it was not considered necessary to subordinate the Canal Officers in any way to the Deputy Commissioners.

(*c*) That it was considered necessary to lay down that the Deputy Commissioner should bring to the notice of Canal Officers any genuine local grievance that may come before him.

As regards (*a*), I again respectfully submit that sufficient attention has not been paid in the case now under consideration to the recommendations of the responsible heads of the Public Works Department, who will have to work the proposed rules. As regards (*b*), if subordination of Executive Engineers to Deputy Commissioners was considered unnecessary in Punjab, such subordination is much less necessary in Madras. As regards (*c*), I invite attention to the fact that in Madras no orders of Government have ever been passed to impress upon the Revenue officers the necessity for co-operation with the Public Works Department and it has been assumed all through that failure to co-operate has been due to the Public Works Department officers. I respectfully submit that this assumption is far from being correct, and that where friction and want of co-operation exist, it is quite as often the fault of the Revenue officers as the Public Works Department.

I believe, for instance, much good would be done if Members of the Board of Revenue when touring could arrange to discuss Irrigation or other Public Works Department matters with Superintending Engineers and bring complaints against the Public Works Department to their notice, but to the best of my knowledge no attempts have been made in this direction

On the contrary it would appear from the notes file that Members of the Board receive numerous complaints from Collectors about which the Chief Engineers of the Public Works Department know nothing.

I have recently brought to the notice of Revenue a case in which the Director of Agriculture, who clearly ought to be in co-operation with Irrigation Officers, has made a general complaint against the Public Works Department in Gódávari with reference to supply of water for sugarcane cultivation. I have heard nothing about this complaint, nor did it appear in the Pipe Committee's report.

(II) My second instance of a very strong argument against the proposed revision of Rule 3 is contained in the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick's final note in the linked file relating to the A and B classification in the Kistna.

I respectfully submit that, if it is the case as assumed by the Honourable Member that the discipline in the Public Works Department is not what it ought to be, it is clearly inadvisable to weaken the powers of Superintending Engineers over their Executive Engineers as will be the inevitable result of the proposed revision of Rule 3.

3. I wish also to draw attention to the very grave risk of interference with the Executive Engineer at the instance of the Collectors' subordinates.

Subordinates invariably take their cue from their superior officers and, if there is any friction between the latter, it spreads downward to the very bottom.

I once took charge of a division in which there had not long before been considerable friction between the Collector and Executive Engineer and there was still a good deal of it existing between the subordinates. The Collector and I being of the same mind, the friction was very soon put an end to by a little knocking together of heads to start with and by making it clearly understood that our subordinates were

not going to be allowed to quarrel. Friction, however, most often starts between the subordinates and, unless the superior officers are working together, it not infrequently results in the friction spreading upwards. Some officers invariably support their own men and sometimes do it without sufficient consideration as to who is right. Collectors of this stamp, and there are some, are extremely likely to be influenced by their subordinates in issuing order to the Executive Engineer, and one case of this kind in a district whether the order is justifiable or not will inevitably result in friction between the subordinates.

4. In conclusion, I should like to be allowed to point out that I have spent by far the greatest part of my thirty years' service up country in intimate connection with Revenue officers of all ranks, and I am now for the first time forced into a serious difference of opinion with that department.

I claim to know as well as anybody where the shoe pinches and what are the chief causes of friction, and I respectfully emphasise my opinion that the proposed revision of Rule 3 will be a very grave mistake as it will undoubtedly increase friction where it exists at present and will produce it where it does not exist.

Friction between the two departments is most objectionable and against Government interests, and for this reason I have done, and shall continue to do, all that I can to dissuade Government from passing the order, as, in doing this, I am quite certain that I am acting in the interests of Government. As pointed out by the Secretary, the proposed revision of Rule 3 clearly comes under the head of a "substantial change of "system" and has therefore to be submitted to India before issue in accordance with their request in the linked file, but I need hardly say that, if and when the order in question is finally issued, I shall, if still in Government service, loyally endeavour to make it work in the same way in which I claim to have loyally carried out throughout my whole service the wishes of Government in the direction of co-operation between Revenue and Public Works Department.

C.A.S.
3-9-10.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Under Secretary—

Submitted.

P.T.S.
6-9-10.

Secretary —

The draft may, I submit, be accepted in Revenue.

F.N.
6-9-10.

Honourable Member—
Hon'ble Mr. Hammick, C.S.I.—

As the Hon'ble Mr. Wilson says at the beginning of his note, dated 21st August 1910, the draft Government order embodies the decision arrived at in the Order in Council of 12th August 1910.

2. In these circumstances it would, I think, be out of place to attempt a new discussion on this subject. Just a year has elapsed since, on 1st September 1909, this department sent a draft on this file to the Public Works Department for acceptance. *Interest reipublicae ut sit finis litium.* It certainly seems undesirable to prolong this controversy. The draft may, I submit, be *accepted.*

A.G.C.
6-9-10.

I agree that the draft may be accepted.

J. N. A[TKINSON].
7-9-10.

61

 G.O., No. 1018 W., 23RD SEPTEMBER 1910.

I agree.

M. H[AMMICK].
8-9-10.

To the Public Works Department u.o.

A.G.C.
9-9-10.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Secretary—

The file may now be circulated to His Excellency the Governor, and the Hon'ble the Maharaja of Bobbili.

2. Under paragraph 7 of the Rules and Orders for the conduct of business in Council, the order arrived at at the Council meeting of the 12th August 1910 requires to be initialled by His Excellency.

G.D.P.
10-9-10.

H.E. the Governor—

The Hon'ble the Maharaja of Bobbili—

F.J.W.
12-9-10.

The Hon'ble Mr. Hammick—

" " *Mr. Atkinson—*

My Honourable Colleagues have accepted the draft order and with them I am not prepared to reconsider its terms.

But I would call attention to the point raised by Mr. Wilson to the effect that, *if* this order involves a " substantial change of system ", then we are precluded from introducing it until we have received the sanction of the Government of India (*vide* their letter, Home Department, Public, No. 3184, dated 20th August 1909, in linked file). I am inclined to agree that this order *does* involve a " substantial change " and that in view of their definite instructions we should obtain their acquiescence before giving effect to the order. Will Revenue therefore include the proposal in their reply to India's letter, setting out the reasons fully? India should be addressed without delay.

A. L[AWLEY].
15-9-10.

I do not, speaking for myself, think that the changes we desire to be made is a " substantial change ". We only give the Collector generally a special power which he is only to exercise for special reasons. In famine time he certainly has this power now. However, if His Excellency wishes this matter referred to India first, I feel I cannot object. I can only regret the further delay that will accrue.

M. H[AMMICK].
16-9-10.

The linked file to which Mr. Wilson refers is that connected with Chapter XIII of the Decentralization Commission's Report, and specially with the relations of Collectors to special departments, of which the Commission particularise Public Works, Police, Excise, Forest and Education. The Government of India " desire to have an opportu-" nity of considering the views of the Government of Madras before any substantial " change of system is made "—*i.e.*, clearly in regard to the relations of Collectors to these special departments *as arising from the Report of the Royal Commission*. There is no reference to matters that have arisen otherwise than from that report. If we were considering some change in the relation of Collectors to Conservators of Forests, or to the Salt, Abkári and Customs Department, we should not dream of submitting it to the Government of India, unless it had arisen out of the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and were of a very sweeping or radical nature.

2. And further I agree with the Hon'ble Mr. Hammick in thinking that the orders we propose to issue do not involve any substantial change of system. I would refer particularly to sections 305, 306 and 308 of the Public Works Department Code. The first of these draws a definite distinction between "positive orders" which an Executive Engineer can receive only from his departmental superiors, the Head of the Administration, *and other Civil officers duly authorised* and "general instructions" which he can receive presumably from officers of other departments, such as Commissioner of a Division and Collectors; and in regard to these latter, "general instructions," the Code provides for a protest from the Executive Engineer in case he considers it necessary, exactly as we have provided in the orders passed in Council. Section 308 further draws a distinction between "professional" matters and others. In the former the Executive Engineer is to take orders from, and submit reports to, the Superintending Engineer alone. The implication clearly is that in non-professional matters other officers, in a position to do so, may issue orders to Executive Engineers.

3. It seems to me, therefore, that the orders passed in Council are in strict accord with the Public Works Department Code, both its letters and its spirit: and that no reference to the Government of India is necessary on what is really an appeal by the Chief Engineer from the Local Government to that of India.

The matter is, however, for His Excellency's decision.

J. N. A[TKINSON].
17-9-10.

I was perhaps inclined to over-estimate the magnitude of the change involved in the draft order. As my Honourable Colleagues have pointed out, it is not in conflict with the existing principles of the Code: and only provides for "special" occasions. It seems to me that this fact has been allowed to disappear and consequently much that has been written regarding the future position of the Superintending Engineer has been written under a misapprehension and would seem to be somewhat irrelevant. There is certainly no reason to contract or limit the functions and powers of Superintending Engineers.

The draft order may issue.

A. L[AWLEY].
22-9-10.

Issue.

F.J.W.
23-9-10.

[G.O., No. 1018 W., dated 23rd September 1910.]

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No.

Subject.— Relation of Public Works Officers to Collectors

NOTES.

Notes to file No. 63 + Recd

2P 1908

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Subject:- Relation ~~in between~~ of P.W.officers ~~and~~ to Collectors.

C. No. 1083 C, From the Board, L.R., No. 2412A, Dated 22 - 7 - 1907.
Confdl.No.61.

To Under Secretary.

4P

In January 1902, certain rules were issued by Government regarding the relation of P.W.officers to Collectors.

G.O. No. 353 W d 31-1-02
A

pp 7-10 of c. file

p 11 et seq of c. file

(The permanent H^d C^k might surely know that the discussion fr wh those rules resulted should be ~~with the~~ put up, as well as the rules themselves)
A.G. 10.8.07

now put up

2. In March last, Mr.Butterworth, ~~the~~ Collector of Trichinopoly, brought to the notice of the Board 24 cases of delay in the disposal of references to the P.W.D. in his district and suggested that, coordinately with ~~the~~ Superintending Engineers, Collectors should have authority to issue orders to Executive Engineers in cases of urgency or undue delay. With reference to this suggestion, the Board points out that delay on the part of P.W.officers in the disposal of references and want of cooperation with the Revenue officials are not confined to the Trichinopoly district and that the rules of January 1902 however well framed can be ineffectual if the officers concerned have not their observance at heart. The Full Board ~~accordingly~~ therefore suggests as ~~to~~ the best remedy the subordination of the

64 B 2 5P

Executive Engineer to the Collector by making him a personal Assistant to the Collector like the District Forest Officer and the Superintendent of Police. In the event of the above proposal not being accepted by Government, the Board recommends,

(1) that personal attention to and greater punctuality in the disposal of correspondence should be insisted on by framing rules similar to those in B.S.O No.165 paragraphs 30 x if such are not in force already in the P.W.D.,

x check of arrears.

(2) that in any case, Executive Engineers should be required to furnish Collectors with quarterly progress reports relating to all correspondence with the Revenue Department and that Collectors should review and submit them through the Board to Government, &

(3) that as a further indication of the Executive Engineer's position and duty, rule 3 of the rules under G.O.No.353 W, dated 31-1-02 should be so modified as to emphasise the fact that the Collector is the administrative head of the district and as such is entitled to the assistance of the Executive Engineer, not mere cooperation as stated in rule 5.

A

3. It is submitted that the Board's proposals

65 ~~11~~ ~~3~~ 6P

may be forwarded to the P.W.D. 40/2 for remarks.

C.A.
3/8/07

Don't print from here to p. 11 A.G.C.

Please abstract each case in the manner ~~show~~ in which I have done the first three. Enter the figures in col 6. in red ink.

J.T.C.
3.8.7

To Under Secy

Please see abstracts appended.

Don't print.

C.A.
7/8/07

I doubt whether this abstract is of much service & it may even mislead. I don't think the Collector's abstracts can usefully be made any shorter. It is necessary to read the Collector's abstracts in order to get any useful idea of the cases.

A.G.C.

Case No.	Subject	Origin of reference	Subsequent reminders to P.W.D	Result up to date of Mr. Butterworth's letter (1-3-07)	Period elapsed since first [illegible]
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Restoration of old Kraman Head to Amar Channel by order of Collector [initials]	Minor Irrigation Grant for 350/- sanctioned by Collector 14.7.01 Work stopped on oral representation of P.W.D. that the Channel would silt up On 13.9.01 P.W.D. requested to push on work for which estimate said to be ready	6.4.02 2.7.04 9.1.06 1.3.06 21.8.06	~~[illegible]~~ Nothing	5 yrs $5\frac{1}{2}$ mos
2	Construction of a dam in Mamundiyar for Samudram tank.	Collector on 2.7.02 referred matter to Executive Engineer who asked for information on 28.8.02 which was supplied on 16.12.02	25.9.03 20.6.04 1.6.06	Nothing	4 yrs 7 mos.
3	Repairs to Tiruttalayar Tanks	On a petition of 5.11.01 by the ryots the question of repairs to the tanks reached P.W.D. on 3.12.01	9.6.02 4.11.06	Work partly complete	5 yrs 3 mos
4	Construction of Alangudi Channel dam and bridge	On a petition from the ryots of Komagudi village in April 05 ~~or~~ (1) Executive Engineer was asked on 18.9.05 to put a wooden dam across the channel (2) Design for a bridge over the Tiruyam and Alangudi Channels sent to Executive Engr. 13.7.06	~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ 14-9-06 16-10-06 17-11-06	Reply from the Ex Engr. that he was not in favour of the dam received on 26.3.06 Design not yet received back	1 yr 6 mos $7\frac{1}{2}$ mos.

Case No.	Subject	Origin of reference	Subsequent reminders to P.W.D	Result up to date of Mr. Butterworth's letter	Period elapsed since first reference to P.W.D
1	2	3	4	5	6
5	Construction of Groynes near the Musiri Nattuvaikal Korambu head.	Petn. objecting to construction of some Groynes in the Cauvery sent to Executive Engr. on 8.7.03 Reply received on 21.7.03 that the construction was unobjectionable. A further objection petn. was sent to Executive Engr. on 1.9.04 and he replied on 2.11.04 that he would inspect the place and report. Reply received on 29.7.05 to say that length of groynes would be shortened. A third petn. objecting to the groynes however small sent to Executive Engr. on 29.1.06. Final reply received on 1-8-06	24.7.05	A new Groyne decided on.	3 yrs 7 mos.
6.	Repairs to the Kottai Vaikkal	From a letter of the Executive Engr. to the Supt. Engr. of 29.2.04 it appeared that steps had been taken to reduce the damage complained of by certain ryots in 1902 owing to floods in the channel. On a petn. of Nov. 1904 the Executive Engr. was asked on 28.1.05 to state whether any steps had been taken to repairing the channel. Repy received on 20.6.05 that the channel was not Imperial work. Executive Engr. asked on 30.6.05 to report on complaint about erection of a dam across the channel referred to in the petition. Executive Engineer asked on 1-9-06 whether silt in the channel will be cleared at cost of P.W.D.	~~6-3-06~~ 6.3.06 3 reminders	Nothing	2 yrs 1 month

Case No.	Subject	Origin of reference	Subsequent reminders to P.W.D	Result up to date given. But [illegible] letter	Period elapsed since first referred to P.W.D
1	2	3	4	5	6
7	Repairs to Kodingal Channel.	Complaints of damages caused by breach of channel in 1903 forwarded to P.W.D. (date not known)	1904 (date not known) 21.10.05	under investigation	about 3 yrs.
8	Repairs to Kannappadi Tank - Musiri Tk.	Petn. regarding repairs to the tank sent to Executive Engr. sometime before 22.11.03 (exact date not known)	22.9.04	Estimate under scrutiny by P.W.D	about 3 yrs 3 mos.
9	Ponneri Channel head, Udaiyarpalayam Tk.	Estimate for Rs 1430 for shifting the Korambu head of the Channel sent to Supg. Engr. on 17-11-88 for remarks. Estimate for Rs 8555 received in July 1889. Supg. Engr. asked to reduce estimate but replied inability to do so on 4.10.89. On receipt of several petns. in 1905 Collector forwarded certain proposal to Executive Engr. on 12.12.05		Ex. Engr. has made an elaborate report on 16.10.06 after inspection	Under discussion since 1888.
10.	Railway affecting tanks	Supg. Engr. asked on 25.7.05 to send a revised list of Ry. affecting tanks	5 reminders 6.1.07	List not yet recd.	1 yr 7 mos.
11.	Koppu Sluice etc and channel.	On a petn. presented by a ryot to the Collr. in Feb. 1900, P.W.D approved the opening of a sluice + channel in 1902 and also framed an estimate for Rs 1300; but on 12.9.05 an endt. was given to the petr. by the Supg. Engr. stating that his request "could not be granted for the present". Petn. on the subject to Collector was sent to Executive Engr. on 27.11.05. Reply recd. 16.12.05. Executive Engr. asked on 23.4.06 to inspect locality with Divl. Officer. Report recd. from Divl. Officer & he issued orders approving scheme on 4.10.06			over ~~about~~ 4 yrs.

Case No	Subject	Origin of reference	Subsequent reminders to P.W.D	Result up to date of Mr. Butterworth's letter	Period elapsed since first referred to P.W.D.
1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	Restoration of Attuvaikkal, Trichinopoly Dt.	Clearance of silt by P.W.D. was partly done when work was stopped on 3.11.03 pending consideration of revised proposals by Executive Engr. Further references to Executive and Supt. Engrs. on 22.3.04 and 20.12.04. Executive Engr. replied on 22.8.05 that fresh scheme costing Rs 12840 has been submitted to Supt. Engr.	27.12.05	Nothing	3 yrs 4 mos
13.	Constn. of Dam across the Srirangam Nattuvaikkal in Kilikkudu village	On the petn. of certain ryots, matter referred to Executive Engr. in 1899. Further petns. of May 1900, Feb 1902, March 1903 forwarded to Executive Engr. who replied in July 1903 that a regulating bridge would be constructed soon after the floods subsided. Further petns. of 9.4.05 and August 1905 sent to Executive Engr.	28.10.03	Nothing	Pending since 1899
14	Nangavaram drainage and Kattuvari	Petn. objecting to construction of drainage under-tunnel proposed by P.W.D referred to Executive Engr. on 3.7.00. Reply of 14.11.01 recd. stating that the drainage work would be carried out. Further reference to Executive Engr. in Dec 1901. On 28.9.03 Executive Engr. asked for some information which was supplied on 8.12.03. Further information regarding contribution by ryots asked for and supplied to Executive Engr. on 4.10.04. Petn. objecting to drainage work forwarded to Supt. Engr. on 7.1.05. Supt. Engr. stated in Oct 1905 that he could not give any definite opinion until complete levels had been taken.	Several reminders 3.10.01 12.5.02 12 reminders Special 17.9.03	Nothing	6 yrs 8 mos

~~8~~ 70

Case No.	Subject	Origin of reference	Subsequent reminders to P.W.D	Result up to date of Mr. Butterworth's letter	Period elapsed since first reference to P.W.D.
1	2	3	4	5	6
15	Tottiyam Periya Vaikkal and Srinivasanallur Channel. Musiri	Repair of breaches in the Channels referred to Executive Engr. on 9.10.05	17.3-06 16.10.06	Estimate in progress	1 yr 4 mos.
16	Providing a feeder channel from the Ariyar to the Dayanur tank, Trichy Tk.	Petn. on the subject sent to Executive Engr. on 24.11.03. Further inforn. asked for by Executive Engr. on 30.11.04 which was supplied on 26.4.06 with request to report on certain points.	5 reminders	Nothing	3 yrs 3 mos.
17	Sluice to Appaunallur Tank, Musiri Tk.	On 1.7.02 Collr. desired Executive Engr. to make local ~~insp~~ inspection as regards repairs of damaged sluice. On 18.10.02 Executive Engr. suggested ~~Constn~~ construction of a new sluice. Ryots objecting to ~~constn~~ construction of new sluice matter was referred to Executive Engr. on 13.7.06. On 18.10.06 Executive Engr. sent an intermediate reply stating that investigation could not be made on account of full supply in the tank.	2.8.05 5 reminders	Nothing	4 yrs 8 mos.
18	Repairs to the Tirunedunkulam tank. Trichy Tk.	Petn. on the subject forwarded to Supt. Engr. on 6.4.03. Further petns. on the subject forwarded to Executive Engr. on 11.4.06 with request to depute a P.W. Officer to make joint inspn. with Civil Officer. On receipt of report Executive Engr. was asked on 6.7.06 to carry out such of the repairs as may be necessary to remedy the defects complained of. Executive Engr. proposed certain repairs on 16.11.06		Nothing	3 yrs 11 mos.

Case No.	Subject	Origin of reference	Subsequent reminders to P.W.D	Result up to date of Mr. Butterworth's letter	Period elapsed since first referred to P.W.D.
1	2	3	4	5	6
19	Providing shutters to the drainage sluices in Panayo-Kurichi village Trichinopoly Tk.	On a petn. on the subject of 30.3.98 the Executive Engr. stated in his letter of 7.5.00 that an estimate had been sanctioned and sent for execution. Nothing had been done until May 04. Executive Engr. written to on 22.8.04 and he replied that the work would be completed in a month. Work not done until July 1906 when ryots complained. Petn. referred to Executive Engr. on 1-8-06	14-11-06	Estimate returned for revision	6 yrs 8 mos.
20.	Kallur Anikut Musiri Tk.	A dispute between the ryots of Amur and Kallur was referred to Executive Engr. on 21.12.02. He made certain proposals on 17.10.03 and the ryots were told to abide by them. In connection with this dispute, Collr. asked Executive Engr. on 25.11.05 to report after joint inspn. with Divl. officer on a suggestion to provide a sand escape for the dam across the Ayyar river. In March 1906 Collr. himself inspected the locality and suggested the provision of a sand sluice. Collr's suggestion was not approved by Supt. Engr. and a revised estimate is being prepared according to Supt. Engr's instructions.		Revised estimate being prepared	4 yrs 2 mos
21	Musiri Mettuvaikkal etc.	On 20.6.05 the Dy. Collr. seems to have addressed the Executive Engr. asking for estimates to close the breaches in the Vari (certain channel). On the matter coming to Collr's notice, the latter asked Executive Engr. on 8.7.05 to send the estimates wanted by the Dy. Collr.	6 reminders	Nothing	1 yr 8 mos.

Case No.	Subject	Origin of reference	Subsequent reminders to P.W.D	Result up to Date of Mr. Butterworth's letter	Period elapsed since first reference to P.W.D
1	2	3	4	5	6
22	Vissambal-samudram Supply Channel	On 15.12.04 the Executive Engr. ~~referred~~ to the Supt. Engr. to ask whether the Channel was an Imperial work and at the same time wrote to the C.W. that the estimate for the repair of the Channel would be completed on receipt of Supt. Engr's orders. In immediate reply of 21.11.05 stating that the work was Imperial and fresh estimate had been called for. In a letter of the Executive Engr. to Supt. Engr. of 20.3.06, it was stated that ordinary repairs that may be required will be estimated for. It is not ~~also~~ known what further action has been taken.	7 reminders.		2 yrs 2 mo[s]
23.	Culvert to the West of Kulikalai Toll Gate.	On 30.9.05, L.F. Engr. addressed Executive Engr. to repair the Culvert. Nothing done until Oct. 1906. Executive Engr. replied on 29.10.06 that Supt. Engr. had returned the estimate unsanctioned and he would resubmit the estimate to him. Supt. Engr. reminded by the President, Dt. Bd. on 22.11.06. In a letter to the Supt. Engr. of 17.12.06 Executive Engr. has stated that the Culvert is unnecessary and that he would write his final opinion later on. But President, Dt. Bd. has asked Executive Engr. to have the Culvert repaired at once	13.10.06 22.11.06		1 yr 5 mo[s]

Case No.	Subject	Origin of reference	Subsequent reminders to P.W.D	Result up to date of Mr. Butterworth's letter	Period elapsed since first referred to P.W.D.
1	2	3	4	5	6
24	Opening of Supply Channel to the Juthur big tank.	On the motion of certain ryots Supd. Engr. was addressed on the subject on 4.9.96. Supd. Engr. replied in May 1898 recommending the ~~Constn.~~ construction of a new head sluice in the Coleroon with a supply channel. Supd. Engr. asked to send plan and estimate on 6.5.98. On 25.3.03, Supd. Engr. withdrew his recommendation and ordered estimates to be prepared for supplying the tank by diverting certain drainage. Executive Engr. reminded on the subject on 9.1.05. Executive Engr. replied on 14.2.05 that estimate for ~~constn.~~ constructing drainage sluice had been sent to Supd. Engr. On a petn. referred to the Executive Engr. the latter stated on 27.4.06 that the estimate had been submitted to the Chief Engr. for sanction GAW 2/8/06	28.4.98 18.7.98 April 1900 July 1900 Several reminders the last of 14.3.02	Estimate sent to Chief Engr.	10 yrs 6 mos

Rule 3

Present rule 3 as ~~Rule~~ in Appendix to G.O.No. 353-W, d/ 31-1-1902 flag Z	Amendment proposed in draft order	Mr.Smith's amendment to Col.2. in pencil on the original draft order.	His Excellency's amendment.	The Hon. the Maharaja of Bobbili	The Hon. Mr. J.N.Atkinson,	The Hon. Mr. Hammick
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. The professional advice of the Public Works Dept. should be wholly at the Collector's service if called for, and such information as he may desire on Public Works in his district should be promptly supplied.	Substitute:- 3. As the Collector is the head of the District, the assistance and professional advice of the P.W.D. are wholly at his disposal if required; any information he may call for should be promptly supplied, and if the Collector for any special reason sees fit to issue any definite instruction to the Ex.Engineer, it should ordinarily be complied with. If the Ex.Engr. considers that it is not in the public interests that he should comply with such instruction, he may ask the Collector to refer the matter to Govt. through the Suptg.Engr., and the Collr. in that case should at once do so.	Insert at the end of rule 3:- In all cases where the Collr. issues any instruction to the Ex. Engr., he will simultaneously send a copy to the Suptg.Engr. for information. Pencil amendment in draft order. Mr.Smith however objected to the revision of the rule 3 Col. 2. Vide his note dated 4-12-09 on page 33 of notes. Note:- Mr.Smith has subsequently accepted H.E's amendments - Vide his note dated 27-6-10 on page 35 of notes.	Substitute:- As the Collector is the head of the district, the assistance and professional advice of the P.W.D are wholly at his disposal if required; any information which he may call for shall be promptly supplied; if the Collector, for any special reason, sends any other definite request to the Ex. Engr., it should ordinarily be complied with; but if the Ex.Engr. considers that it is not in the public interests that he should comply with the request, he will without delay discuss the matter personally with the Collector or report his reasons in writing to the Collector who will address the Suptg.Engr. or the Board of Revenue if he wishes to press it. Page 34 of notes.	Accepts His Excellency's amendments in column 4. Page 36 of notes.	Remarks that H.E's re-draft of Rule 3 does not take sufficient account of cases of special emergencies. Will raise no objection to the change of the word "instruction" in Col.2 into "request" as in Col.4. provided the case of grave and sudden emergencies is distinguished, by the addition which the H.M. proposes to Rule 5, Col.6 of the statement ~~relating to~~ which please see. Page 37 of notes.	Objects to replacing the word "instruction" in Col.2 by "request" in Col.4. Does not think, if H.E's draft is approved, the relation of the departments will be a bit improved. Would sooner see the existing Rule 3 stand as it is. para 7 of H.M's note dated 4-8-10 on page 39 of notes.

~~Rule~~ Present rule as in Appendix to G.O. No.353-W, d/31-1-1902 Flag Z	Amendment proposed in draft order.	Mr. Smith's amendment to Column 2.	His Excellency's amendment to Column 2.	The Hon. the Maharaja of Bobbili	The Hon. Mr. J.N Atkinson.	The Hon. Mr. Hammick
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. The Collector should have the right to propose the construction of new works and the repairs of existing ones, and his proposal should be disregarded only for reasons to be recorded and communicated to him by the Suptg. Engineer. The Collr. may also make recommendations in regard to other Public Works matters which concern his district, and such recommendations shall be duly considered and promptly replied to.	........NIL........	...NIL.... Mr Smith has accepted H.E's amendment, see his note dated 27-6-10 on page 35 of notes file.	Add to Rule 4:- All proposals for important changes in the distribution of water or in any other branch of Public Works Administration shall be forwarded to the Collr. for remarks before submission to the Suptg. Engineer. The remarks of the Collector shall be forwarded to Govt. or other sanctioning authority, and a copy of the final letter or endorsement of the Ex. Engr. and the Suptg. Engr. shall be sent to the Collr. at the time of despatch. A copy of the final orders passed shall be sent to the Collector before they are carried out. Pages 34 & 35 of notes.	Accepts His Excellency's amendment in Col. 4. Page 36 of notes.	Add:- After "Administration" in Col. 4, "or for allotment or reappropriation of funds regarding which the Collector has not previously been consulted" Page 36 of notes.	Makes verbal alterations in the Hon. Mr. Atkinson's addition in Col 6 as below:- Substitute "to" for "regarding" and "assented" for "been consulted". Marginal remark on page 36 of notes.

Rule 5

Present rule 5 as ~~Rule~~ in Appendix to G.O.No.353-W, d/31-1-1902. Flag Z	Amendment proposed in draft order	Mr.Smith's amendment to Column 2.	His Excellency's amendment.	The Hon.the Maharaja of Bobbili	The Hon.Mr.J.N. Atkinson	The Hon.Mr. Hammick.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. It is desirable that Suptg. and Ex.Engineers should, as much as possible, consult Collectors and Divisional officers personally in regard to the Public Works interests and needs of the district, and all officers of the P.W.D. should co-operate cordially and readily with the Revenue officers of the district.	Add: to rule 5:- All proposals for important changes in the distribution of water or in any other branch of the Public Works Administration should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission ~~for xxxxxxxx~~ to the Suptg.Engineer or to Govt., and the Collector should be furnished with information as to any such changes decided upon before they are carried out.	Insert:- "For sanction" after "submission" in Column 2. Pencil remark On draft order. Note:- Mr.Smith has subsequently accepted H.E's amendments-Vide his note dated 27-6-10 on page 35 of notes.	Modifies the amendment in Column 2 and adds it to Rule 4, which please see. **Add to present Rule 5** This is particularly important in times of emergency such as famine and flood, at such times the P.W.D.Officers should, as far as possible, keep the Collector and Divisional officers informed of their movements and of the measures they are taking for dealing with the emergency. Page 35 of notes.	Accepts His Excellency's amendment in Column 4. Page 36 of notes.	Omits the words "famine and" in Column 4 and proposes an additional Rule as below:- In the case of famine the relations of P.W.D officers to Collectors are laid down in the Famine Code. In other grave or sudden emergencies, such as riots and civil commotions, floods fires or storms, when life or property is seriously endangered, all officers of the P.W D.within the limits of the district shall obey the Collector's orders on all points not exclusively professional. Paras 10 & 11 of H.M's note dated 23-7-10 on page 38 of notes.	Does not like amendment in Col.6 nor H.E's proposal. Much prefers the orders as originally approved Has no objection to add to the order some words to show that the Collector is not expected to interfere with the P.W.D.officers in his district in what are exclusively professional matters. Would like to see the position defined in somewhat the sameway as is that of the Supdt. of Police-Viz that the Ex.Engr.in every district should maintain intimate official relation with the Revenue officers of all ranks, and keep the Collector specially informed of all matters relating to the well-being of the district from an engineering aspect, that the Ex.Engr. is the Collector's assistant for engineering purposes, and that, while the Collector should not interefere ordinarily with the Ex.Engr. in any clearly professional matter the assistance and professional advice, &c.&c., as in the order drafted. Paras 5 & 6 of H.M's note dated 4-8-10 on page 39 of Notes

1018 W
23/9/10

77 ~~63~~ ~~10~~

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Order in Council of 12/8/10

~~[illegible]~~ Have the draft order recopied as amended in Council —

~~[illegible]~~ The passage on p. 2 of the typed copy at side has been supported as necessary by ~~[illegible]~~ Mr Smith the point having been included when the matter was before council & is part of amend. of H.E., or others —

[illegible]
12/8/10

Omit

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

Order—No. W., dated June 1910.

In his letter to the Board of Revenue, No. 12 (Confdl.), dated the 1st March 1907, the Collector of Trichinopoly (Mr. Butterworth) brought to notice twenty-four cases, in which references to the Public Works Department had long remained unanswered, as indicative of the unsatisfactory condition of the present system under which the Collector has no control over the Executive Engineer and suggested that the Collector should have some power conjointly with the Superintending Engineer to direct the movements of the Executive Engineer. In submitting this letter to the Government the Board of Revenue observed that such delays were not peculiar to the Trichinopoly district, that the Collector of Chingleput (Mr. Dance) had reported similar delays in 1903 and that instances of the kind could be quoted from other districts also, and suggested that the most effective remedy would be to subordinate the Executive Engineer to the Collector by making him a Personal Assistant to the Collector like the District Forest Officer and the Superintendent of Police. In the event of this proposal not commending itself to Government the Board offered the following suggestions for securing an improvement in the disposal of correspondence: (1) that an arrear list should be maintained by the Executive Engineer as laid down in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30, for Revenue offices; (2) that the Executive Engineer should be required to furnish to the Collector quarterly progress reports relating to all correspondence with the Revenue Department, which the Collector should review and submit to the Government through the Board; and (3) that rule 3 of the rules regarding the relation of the Public Works Department Officers to the Collector should be modified so as to emphasize the fa[ct] that the Collector is the administrative head of the district and as such is entitle[d] to the *assistance* (not mere co-operation) of the Executive Engineer.

2. The question of the relationship between Collectors and Officers of the Public Works Department will come under consideration when dealing with the proposals made by the Decentralization Commission in this regard.

2 3. In the appendix to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, certain rules were laid down regarding the relations of the Public Works Department Officers to Collectors of districts. The present correspondence and that relating to the changes introduced into the system of distributing water for irrigation in the Gódávari delta dealt with in G.O., No. 2401, dated 28th August 1908, has shown the need for amplifying these rules in some respects, and in reissuing them with the modifications referred to below the Government desire to lay particular stress upon the following considerations which should be continually borne in mind:—

(*a*) that the Superintending Engineer and the Executive Engineer should thoroughly understand that no important innovation or change in administration should be undertaken by them without informing the Collector fully on the subject;

(*b*) that the Collector has the right to obtain without delay any information he desires as regards the Public Works Department work in his district;

(*c*) that the Collector should have power to *stop any important changes* in the existing order of things as regards distribution of water until the matter has been referred to the Government; and

(*d*) that the Collector should have the means of seeing whether his letters and references to the Public Works Department in his district are being properly attended to.

Omit in print

79 68 42

No. W., June 1910.

3 ~~4~~. To give effect to these directions rules 3 and 5 of the rules laid down in the appendix to G.O., No. 353 W., dated 31st January 1902, will be amended as indicated below:—

Rule 3.—*Substitute* the following *for* the present rule 3:—

"3. As the Collector is the head of the district, the assistance and professional advice of the Public Works Department are wholly at his disposal if required; any information he may call for should be promptly supplied, and if the Collector for any special reason sees fit to issue any definite instruction to the Executive Engineer, it should ordinarily be complied with. If the Executive Engineer considers that it is not in the public interests that he should comply with such instruction, he may ask the Collector to refer the matter to Government through the Superintending Engineer, and the Collector in that case should at once do so." #

Rule 5.—*Add* the following sentence to the present rule 5:—

"All proposals for important changes in the distribution of water or in any other branch of the Public Works administration should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission (for sanction) to the Superintending Engineer or to Government, and the Collector should be furnished with information as to any such changes decided upon before they are carried out."

5 ~~5~~. As suggested by the Board of Revenue, Executive Engineers should furnish Collectors with quarterly lists of unanswered references, showing what steps have been taken to get the subject disposed of and should maintain in their offices an arrear list like that prescribed in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30, for Revenue offices.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

I suggest inserting the words (for sanction) as the rule as worded would prevent any reference to the S.E. and changes may sometimes require previous discussion with the S.E. C.A.S 20/11/[illegible]

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Superintending Engineers.
" the Revenue Department with copies of notes.

CONFIDENTIAL.

G.O., No. W., June 1910.

Insert at the end of rule 3.

"In all cases where the Collector
" issues any instruction to the Ex. Eng.,
" he will simultaneously send a copy
" to the Supg. Eng. for information"

C.A.S

~~Notification~~

4 ~~5~~. The complete rules as now amended are published as an annexure to this G.O.

Omit in print　　*~~66~~ 80 / 43*

Rules ~~revised~~ as in the proposed

draft order.

****

Council 12/8/10

Rules regarding the relation of Public Works officers to Collectors of Districts.

****

In framing the District Public Works Budget, Superintending Engineers should invariably consult the Collectors concerned in sufficient time for thorough discussion of the proposed programme and with full explanation of the scope and object of the works included therein. If, in any case, Suptg.Engineers are unable to adopt Collectors suggestions, they should record their reasons for differing from the Collectors and submit the record to Government along with the Budget. At the same time a copy of these reasons and a copy of the budget, as finally submitted by the Suptg.Engineer to Government, should also be communicated to the Collector.

2. Works not provided for in the budget should not, except in cases of emergency, be commenced without the Collector's previous approval, and when so commenced, intimation should at once be given to him.

3. As the Collector is the *responsible* head of the district, *and* the assistance and professional advice of the P.W.D. are wholly at his disposal if required. Any information he may call for should be promptly supplied. ~~and if~~ The Collector *may* for any special reason ~~sees fit to~~ issue any definite instruction to the Executive Engineer, ~~it should ordinarily be complied with~~. If the Ex.Engineer considers that ~~it~~ *such instruction* is not in the public interests ~~that~~ he ~~should comply with such instruction, he~~ may ask the Collector *if time allows* to refer the matter to Government through the Suptg.Engineer, and the Collector

81

Otherwise the Collector's instructions shall be complied with

in that case should at once do so.

4. The Collector should have the right to propose the construction of new works and the repairs of existing ones, and his proposal should be disregarded only for reasons to be recorded and communicated to him by the Suptg.Engr. The Collector may also make recommendations in regard to other Public Works matters which concern his district, and such recommendations shall be duly considered and promptly replied to.

5. It is desirable that Suptg. and Executive Engineers should, as much as possible, consult Collectors and divisional officers personally in regard to the Public Works interests and needs of the district, and all officers of the P.W.D. should co-operate cordially and readily with the Revenue officers of the district. All proposals for important changes in the distribution of water or in any other branch of the P.W.administration should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission to the Suptg.Engineer or to Government, and the Collector should be furnished with information as to any such changes decided upon before they are carried out.

For Sanction

6. Public Works officers will follow strictly in future the rule enjoining that no lands should be entered upon until formally transferred by the Revenue Department.

7. Superintending Engineers should themselves submit complete budget estimates of the requirements of all departments within the limits of their Circles, Executive Engineers of divisions obtaining from departments concerned the necessary information in regard to new works to be undertaken and the order of their urgency. Suptg.Engrs. will also assist the local heads of such departments with advice and information without delay when asked for, and in cases in which difference of opinion may exist, will discuss the matter fully with them.

****

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DW.

As has been marked by W on page 58 of the notes, the file was first sent in Circulation to H.E. H.E with his remarks passed the file on to Hms 1+2. The file with their remarks was ~~again~~ returned to H.E. who has now sent it ~~to~~ C.W.D. It is Submitted for orders whether the file may now be sent in Circulation to Hm 3 before the order is issued.

KSL
23.9.10
Cir. Clerk

G.R.
23.9.10

W [initials] 23/9

Not necessary
Issue orders

[initials]
28/9/10

83

Revised draft order

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Quote with abstract as given in the attached slip

From orders in Council

Read again:-

G.O.No.353-W, dated 31st January 1902.
G.O.No.1581-W, dated 2nd June 1902

Read also:-

Print Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Rev), No. 2412-A, (Confdl. No. 61) dated 22nd July 1907.

Omit in print

General Establishment

O R D E R:- No. 1018 W, dated 23 Septr./10 P. 30

In his letter to the Board of Revenue, No. 12(Confdl), dated the 1st March 1907, the Collector of Trichinopoly (Mr. Butterworth) brought to notice twenty-four cases, in which references to the Public Works Department had long remained unanswered, as indicative of the unsatisfactory condition of the present system under which the Collector has no control over the Executive Engineer and suggested that the Collector should have some power conjointly with the Superintending Engineer to direct the movements of the Executive Engineer. In submitting this letter to the Government the Board of Revenue observed that such delays were not peculiar to the Trichinopoly District, that the Collector of Chingleput (Mr. Dance) had reported similar delays in 1903 and that instances of the kind could be quoted from other districts also, and suggested that the most effective remedy would be to subordinate the Executive Engineer to the Collector

by

by making him a Personal Assistant to the Collector like the District Forest Officer and the Superintendent of Police. In the event of this proposal not commending itself to Government the Board offered the following suggestions for securing an improvement in the disposal of correspondence: (1) that an arrear list should be maintained by the Executive Engineer as laid down in Board's Standing Order No.165, paragraph 30, for Revenue offices; (2) that the Executive Engineer should be required to furnish to the Collector quarterly progress reports relating to all correspondence with the Revenue Department, which the Collector should review and submit to the Government through the Board; and (3) that rule 3 of the rules regarding the relation of the Public Works Department Officers to the Collector should be modified so as to emphasise the fact that the Collector is the administrative head of the district and as such is entitled to the assistance (not mere co-operation) of the Executive Engineer.

2. In the appendix to G.O.No.353-W, dated 31st January 1902, certain rules were laid down regarding the relations of Public Works Department Officers to Collectors of districts. The present correspondence and that relating to the changes introduced into the system of

distributing

distributing water for irrigation in the Godavari delta dealt with in G.O., No.2401,Revenue,dated 28th August 1908, has shown the need for amplifying these rules in some respects, and in reissuing them with the modifications referred to below the Government desire to lay particular stress upon the following considerations which should be continually borne in mind:-

(a) that the Superintending Engineer and the Executive Engineer should thoroughly understand that no important innovation or change in administration should be undertaken by them without informing the Collector fully on the subject;

(b) that the Collector has the right to obtain without delay any information he desires as regards the Public Works Department work in his district, and the Engineers should avoid delay in dealing with communications from the Collector which are marked as urgent or important.

(c) that the Collector should have power to stop any important changes in the existing order of things as regards distribution of water until the matter has been referred to the Government;and

(d) that the Collector should have the means of seeing whether his letters and references to the Public Works Department in his district are being properly attended to.

3.

97 86 6 P

3. To give effect to these directions rules 3 and 5 of the rules laid down in the appendix to G.O.No.353-W, dated 31st January 1902 are amended as follows:-

Rule 3:- Substitute the following for the present rule 3:-

The Collector is the responsible head of the district, and the assistance and professional advice of the Public Works Department are wholly at his disposal if required. Any information he may call for should be promptly supplied. The Collector may for any special reason issue any definite instruction to the Executive Engineer. If the Executive Engineer considers that such instruction is not in the public interests and if time allows he may ask the Collector to refer the matter to Government through the Superintending Engineer, and the Collector in that case should at once do so. Otherwise the Collector's instructions shall be complied with.

Rule 5:-Substitute the following for the present rule 5:-

It is desirable that Superintending and Executive Engineers should, as much as possible, consult Collectors and Divisional Officers personally in regard to the Public Works interests and

92 87

and needs of the district, and all officers of the Public Works Department should co-operate cordially and readily with the Revenue officers of the district. All proposals for important changes in the distribution of water or in any other branch of the Public Works Administration should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission for sanction to the Superintending Engineer or to Government, and the Collector should be furnished with information as to any such changes decided upon before they are carried out.

× P. T. O.

4. The complete rules as now amended are printed as an annexure to this Order.

5. As suggested by the Board of Revenue, Executive Engineers should furnish Collectors with quarterly lists of unanswered references, showing what steps have been taken to get the subject disposed of and should maintain in their offices an arrear list similar to that prescribed in Board's Standing Order No. 165, paragraph 30, for Revenue offices.

14.9.10.

31/8/10

W

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

,, ,, Superintending Engineers

,, ,, Revenue Department with copies of notes.

Despd 7.10.1910.

Despd 10.10.1910

O/P.

~~notes to be sent on receipt~~

93-88

848

Annexure to G.O.No. 1018W dated 23.9.10

***

Rules regarding the relation of Public Works officers to Collectors of Districts.

****

In framing the District Public Works Budget, Superintending Engineers should invariably consult the Collectors concerned in sufficient time for thorough discussion of the proposed programme, and with full explanation of the scope and object of the works included therein. If, in any case, Superintending Engineers are unable to adopt Collectors suggestions, they should record their reasons for differing from the Collectors and submit the record to Government along with the Budget. At the same time a copy of these reasons and a copy of the budget, as finally submitted by the Superintending Engineer to Government should also be communicated to the Collector.

2. Works not provided for in the budget should not, except in cases of emergency, be commenced without the Collector's previous approval, and when so commenced, intimation should at once be given to him.

3. The Collector is the responsible head of the district, and the assistance and professional advice of the Public Works Department are wholly at his disposal if required. Any information he may call for should be promptly supplied. The Collector may for any special reason issue any definite instruction to the Executive Engineer. If the Executive Engineer considers that such instruction is not in the public interests, and if time allows, he may ask the Collector to refer the matter to Government through the Suptg. Engineer, and the Collector in that case should at once do so. Otherwise the Collector's instructions shall be complied with.

4. The Collector should have the right to propose the construction of new works and the repairs of existing ones, and his proposal should be disregarded only for reasons to be recorded and communicated to him by the Superintending Engineer. The Collector may also make recommendations in regard to other Public Works matters which concern his district, and such recommendations shall be duly considered and promptly replied to.

5. It is desirable that Superintending and Executive Engineers should, as much as possible, consult Collectors and Divisional officers personally in regard to the Public Works interests and needs of the district, and all officers of the Public Works Department should co-operate cordially and readily with the Revenue officers of the district. All proposals for important changes in the distribution of water, or in any other branch of the Public Works Administration, should be forwarded to the Collector for remarks before submission for sanction to the Superintending Engineer or to Government, and the Collector should be furnished with information as to any such changes decided upon before they are carried out.

6. Public Works officers will follow strictly in future the rule enjoining that no lands should be entered upon until formally transferred by the Revenue Department.

7. Superintending Engineers should themselves submit complete budget estimates of the requirements of all departments within the limits of their Circles, Executive Engineers of divisions obtaining from departments concerned the necessary information in regard to new works to be undertaken and the order of their urgency. Superintending Engineers will also assist the local heads of such departments with advice and information without delay when asked for, and in cases in which differences of opinion may exist, will

discuss

~~25-2-41~~ | 16

30-1-46 / 86 q